



Proceedings of the 67th ANNUAL CONVENTION

NCAA

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS / JANUARY 11-13, 1973

1973 NCAA CONVENTION PROCEEDINGS



THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION

U. S. Highway 50 and Nail Avenue

P.O. Box 1906

Shawnee Mission, Kansas 66222

Phone 913/384-3220

April 1973

Proceedings
of the
67th Annual
Convention
of the
National Collegiate
Athletic Association

Palmer House
Chicago, Illinois
January 11-13, 1973

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Register 1973

Administrative Organization	5
Convention Delegates, Visitors and Working News Media	9

II. Proceedings of the 67th Annual Convention

Delegates Orientation Session	21
Opening Business Session	
1. Opening Remarks	29
2. Explanation of Voting Procedures	31
3. Further Explanation by the President	32
4. Report of the Secretary-Treasurer	32
5. Report of the Executive Committee	34
6. Report of the Council	36
7. Reports of Other Committees	41
8. Report of the Television Committee	42
9. Report of the Joint Legislative Committee	43
10. Proposed Amendments	
Transfer of Membership	46
Committee Chairmen	46
Competitive Safeguards Committee	46
Committees	47
Drug Education Committee	47
Track and Field Committee	48
Soccer Committee	48
Swimming Committee	48
Wrestling Committee	49
Baseball Committee	49
Volleyball Committee	50
Amendments	50
Reconsideration of Proposal No. 9	50
11. Report of the Memorial Resolutions Committee	51
Combined University and College Division Round Table	54
Honors Luncheon	78
Continuance of Business Session	
12. Proposed Amendments	
Revision of the Agenda	97
Membership Division	99
Awards	104
Amateurism	106
Ice Hockey Eligibility	106
Summer Financial Aid	107

Graduate Eligibility	108
Outside Financial Aid	108
Orientation Programs	111
Enforcement	113
Five-Year Rule	115
Hardship	117
Five-Year Rule	117
Summer Basketball	117
Out-of-Season Basketball	118
Soccer Eligibility	118
Enforcement	119
Continuance of Business Session	
13. Supplementary Report of the Memorial Resolutions Committee	122
14. Proposed Amendments	
Swimming Committee	122
One-Year Award	123
Limitations on Financial Aid Awards	123
Financial Aid Limitation	125
Financial Aid	129
Determination of Financial Need	129
Motion to Reconsider No. 15	136
Candidates Acceptance Form	138
Employment of Coaches	140
1.600 Rule	142
Continuance of Business Session	
15. Proposed Amendments	
No. 75 Effective Immediately	148
1.600 Rule	148
Transfer Rule	157
Recruiting Publicity	158
Sports Camps	158
Off-Campus Entertainment	159
Complimentary Tickets	159
Recruiting Contracts	159
Automobile Transportation	160
Entertainment	160
Football Bowl Officials	160
Basketball Playing Season	161
Baseball Playing Season	161
Foreign Tours	162
Football Championships	163
Freshman Rule	163
Hardship	164

Alien Student-Athletes	165
Transfer Rule	166
Eligibility for NCAA Championships	166
Drugs	166
Ineligible Participation	166
College Division Regional Championships	167
College Division Soccer Championship	167
College Division Lacrosse Championship	167
Waiver of Bylaws Provision	167
Enforcement Procedure	168
Discipline of Members	171
Infractions Committee	171
Enforcement	172
16. Executive Regulations	172
17. Other Business	173
18. Report of Committee on Committees	176
19. Report of the Nominating Committee	177

III. Appendices

Appendix A: Proposed Amendments	A- 1
Appendix B: Executive Regulations	A-59
Appendix C: Amendments to Amendments	A-62
Appendix D: Enforcement Program	A-68
Appendix E: Convention Committees	A-74
Appendix F: Past and Present Officers of the NCAA	A-76
Appendix G: NCAA Convention Sites 1944-1975	A-77

1973 NCAA ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION

NCAA Officers

President

ALAN J. CHAPMAN
Professor of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering
Box 1892, Rice University, Houston, Texas 77001

Secretary-Treasurer

RICHARD P. KOENIG, *Vice-President for Public and Alumni Affairs*
Valparaiso University, Valparaiso, Indiana 46383

Executive Director

WALTER BYERS, U.S. Highway 50 and Nall Avenue
P.O. Box 1906, Shawnee Mission, Kansas 66222

The Council

The Council is elected by the annual Convention of the Association. The NCAA president and secretary-treasurer are ex officio members and serve as chairman and secretary, respectively. Nine members of the Council are the eight district vice-presidents and the vice-president-at-large, each of whom is elected for two years and may be immediately reelected for one additional term. Seven members are elected at-large for terms of three years and may not be reelected until three years have elapsed.

Term Expires

District 1 Vice-President—Robert W. Pritchard	Jan. 1974
Head, Department of Physical Education and Athletics Worcester Polytechnic Institute, Worcester, Mass. 01609	
District 2 Vice-President—Ernest C. Casale	Jan. 1975
Director of Athletics Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19122	
District 3 Vice-President—Ralph E. Fadum	Jan. 1974
Dean, School of Engineering, 229 Riddick Bldg., Box 5518 North Carolina State University, Raleigh, N.C. 27607	
District 4 Vice-President—John A. Fuzak	Jan. 1975
Associate Dean and Director, School for Advanced Studies, College of Education Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 48823	
District 5 Vice-President—Stanley J. Marshall	Jan. 1974
Director, Health, Physical Education and Recreation; Director of Athletics South Dakota State University, Brookings, S. D. 57006	
District 6 Vice-President—J. Neils Thompson	Jan. 1975
Professor of Civil Engineering University of Texas, Austin, Texas 78712	

1973 NCAA ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION

The Council (Continued)

- District 7 Vice-President*—Louis A. MyersJan. 1974
Professor of Accounting, College of Business and
Public Administration
University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona 85721
- District 8 Vice-President*—George F. IlgJan. 1975
Assistant Dean, School of Agricultural Sciences
Fresno State University, Fresno, California 93726
- Vice-President-at-Large*—Ross H. SmithJan. 1974
Professor; Director of Athletics
Massachusetts Institute of Technology,
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139
- Member-at-Large*—Harry M. CrossJan. 1974
Professor of Law
University of Washington, Seattle, Washington 98195
- Member-at-Large*—J. William DavisJan. 1974
Professor of Government
Texas Tech University, Lubbock, Texas 79409
- Member-at-Large*—William ExumJan. 1975
Chairman, Department of Health, Physical Education and Athletics
Kentucky State University, Frankfort, Kentucky 40601
- Member-at-Large*—Howard C. GentryJan. 1974
Professor of Health, Physical Education and Recreation
Tennessee State University, Nashville, Tenn. 37203
- Member-at-Large*—Walter L. HassJan. 1975
Chairman, Department of Physical Education
University of Chicago
5640 University Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60637
- Member-at-Large*—J. William OrwigJan. 1976
Professor of Health, Physical Education and Recreation
Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana 47401
- Member-at-Large*—David SwankJan. 1975
Professor of Law and Director of Clinical Legal Education
University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma 73069

1973 NCAA ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION

Executive Committee

The NCAA president, vice-president-at-large and secretary-treasurer shall be ex officio members of the Executive Committee. The remaining seven members of the Committee are elected by the Council for a period of one year. At least one new member shall be elected each year. Date of first election is shown in parentheses.

- Stan Bates (Jan. 1970)
Commissioner, Western Athletic Conference
1515 Cleveland Place, Denver, Colorado 80202
- Wayne Duke (April 1969)
Commissioner, Big Ten Conference
505 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60611
- William J. Flynn (Jan. 1971)
Director of Athletics
Boston College, Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts 02167
- Marcus L. Plant (Jan. 1969)
Professor of Law, 332 Hutchins Hall
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104
- Earl M. Ramer (Jan. 1973)
Professor of Education, 13 Henson Hall
University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee 37916
- Polk F. Robison (Jan. 1970)
Athletic Administrator of Finance and Development
Texas Tech University, Lubbock, Texas 79409
- Marshall S. Turner Jr. (Jan. 1972)
Chairman, Department of Physical Education and Athletics
Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland 21218

Executive Office

- Walter Byers, *Executive Director*
Arthur J. Bergstrom, *Controller*
Warren S. Brown, *Assistant Executive Director*
Thomas C. Hansen, *Assistant Executive Director*
Louis J. Spry, *Assistant Executive Director*
- David Berst, *Executive Assistant*
Lester J. Burks, *Executive Assistant*
Thomas C. Combs, *Events Manager*
Dave R. Daniel, *Editor, NCAA NEWS*
Marjorie Fieber, *Business Manager*
Grayle W. Howlett, *Promotion Director*
William B. Hunt, *Executive Assistant*
Carl Eugene Jacobs, *Publications Editor*
Thomas W. Jernstedt, *Director of Events*
Jerry Miles, *Director of Public Relations*
Ted C. Tow, *Director of Publications*
Fannie Vaughan, *Administrative Assistant*
Shirley Whitacre, *Administrative Assistant*
James H. Wilkinson, *Assistant Controller*

1973 NCAA ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION

Service Bureau

John T. Waters, *Director*
Jim Van Valkenburg, *Associate Director*
Frank Barning, *Compilations*
Steve Boda, *Research*
Chris Erles, *Compilations*
Jerry Klein, *Compilations*
Ron Schwartz, *News Film*

NATIONAL COLLEGIATE SPORTS SERVICES
420 Lexington Avenue
New York, New York 10017
Area Code 212; Phone 685-9622

The Service Bureau collects, compiles and distributes the official statistics of college football, basketball and baseball and performs other services commonly associated with a sports information and promotional agency.

Publishing Service

Homer F. Cooke Jr., *Director*
Marie Montana, *Assistant Director*
Jonathan Clark, *General Editor*
Geraldine Paul, *Circulation Manager*
Wallace Renfro, *Publications Editor*

COLLEGE ATHLETICS PUBLISHING SERVICE
349 East Thomas Road
Phoenix, Arizona 85012
Area Code 602; Phone 264-5656

The Service publishes the official guides, rule books and scorebooks of the Association

Film Service

Richard S. Snider, *Director*
NCAA OFFICIAL FILMS
P.O. Box 2726
Wichita, Kansas 67201
Area Code 316; Phone 267-2828

The Service produces and maintains the official films of the Association

SIXTY-SEVENTH ANNUAL CONVENTION

DELEGATES AND VISITORS

Active Member Institutions

District One

American International College: Milton J. Piepul
Amherst College: Benjamin F. McCabe
Assumption College: Andrew Laska
Bates College: Lloyd H. Lux
Bentley College: Elwood N. Shields
Boston College: William Flynn, David Carroll
Boston State College: James P. Sullivan
Boston University: Warren H. P. Schmakel
Bowdoin College: Edmund L. Coombs
Brandeis University: Nicholas Rodis
Bridgeport, University of: Edward G. Farrell
Bridgewater State College: Edward C. Swenson
Brown University: Ferdinand Geiger, Robert Seiple
Castleton State College: T. Richard Terry
Central Connecticut State College: Lowell D. Lukas
Clark University: Russ Granger
Colby College: John W. Winkin
Connecticut, University of: John L. Toner, Paul N. Taylor
Dartmouth College: Seaver Peters, Alden H. Burnham
Eastern Connecticut State College: Dana Clark
Fairfield University: C. Donald Cook
Harvard University: Robert B. Watson
Holy Cross College: Ronald S. Perry
Lowell Technological Institute: W. W. Yarnall
Maine, University of, Gorham: Richard A. Costello
Maine, University of, Orono: Harold S. Westerman
Massachusetts, University of: Frank McInerney, Robert W. O'Connell,
David C. Bischoff
Massachusetts Institute of Technology: Ross H. Smith
Merrimack College: Thom Lawler
Middlebury College: Richard W. Colman Jr.
New England College: Leslie L. LaFond
New Hampshire, University of: Andrew Mooradian
New Haven, University of: Donald R. Ormrod
Nichols College: Hal Chalmers
North Adams State College: Joseph Zavattaro
Northeastern University: Herbert W. Gallagher, Joseph Zabilski
Norwich University: Robert B. Priestley
Rhode Island, University of: Maurice Zarchen
Sacred Heart University: J. Donald Feeley
Salem State College: Richard C. Schneider
St. Michael's College: Edward Markey

Southern Connecticut State College: Jess L. Dow, Eugene Shelar
 Springfield College: Edward S. Steitz
 Trinity College: Karl Kurth
 Tufts University: Harry Arlanson
 Vermont, University of: J. Edward Donnelly, Denis Lambert, James S. Pacy, Robert W. Cochran
 Wesleyan University: Donald M. Russell, Norman Daniels
 Westfield State College: F. Paul Bogan
 Williams College: Robert R. Peck
 Worcester Polytechnic Institute: Robert M. Pritchard
 Worcester State College: Robert A. Devlin
 Yale University: DeLaney Kiphuth, James E. Holgate

District Two

Adelphi University: Ronald Bazil
 Albany, State University of New York: John R. Tibbetts, Joseph Garcia, Alfred Werner
 Alfred University: Alex Nunevich
 American University: Robert Frailey
 Bernard M. Baruch College: Lou Brown, Alfred Peredo
 Bethany College: Robert Goin
 Binghamton, State University of New York: Curtis A. Coutts, Robert Kreidler
 Bloomsburg State College: Conrad Bautz
 Brockport, State University College: Dick Youngberg
 Brooklyn College: Charles Tobey
 Bucknell University: Robert Latour
 Buffalo, State University of New York: Harry Fritz, Robert C. Deming, Mildred Heap
 California State College: Paul E. Ross
 Canisius College: James L. Bedell
 Cheyney State College: Edwin W. Lawrence
 Clarion State College: Frank Lignelli
 Clarkson College: John Hantz
 Colgate University: Harold W. Lahar
 Columbia University: Kenneth G. Germann
 Cornell University: Robert J. Kane
 Cortland, State University College: Francis J. Woods
 Delaware, University of: David M. Nelson, Arnold M. Clark, Scotty Duncan
 Delaware State College: James H. Williams
 Delaware Valley College: Ned H. Linta
 Dickinson College: David B. Eavenson
 District of Columbia Teachers College: Samuel E. Barnes
 Drexel University: John Semanik
 Duquesne University: Clair N. Brown, Donato DeFelice
 East Stroudsburg State College: John R. Eiler, Robert G. Sutton
 Edinboro State College: Allan W. Hall
 Elizabethtown College: John M. Tulley
 Elmira College: Paul Brand
 Fairleigh Dickinson University, Madison: Robert T. Shields
 Fairleigh Dickinson University, Teaneck: Harvey Woods, Walter Marusyn
 Fordham University: Peter Carlismo

Fredonia State University College: Everett J. Phillips
 Geneseo State University College: Daniel T. Mullin, Robert F. Riedel
 Georgetown University: Francis X. Rienzo
 George Washington University: Bob Faris
 Gettysburg College: Eugene M. Haas
 Glassboro State College: William Fritz
 Hamilton College: Eugene Long
 Hampton Institute: Herman N. Neilson, Samuel Massenberg
 Hartwick College: Leroy Chipman
 Haverford College: Dana W. Swan
 Herbert Lehman College: Michael M. Fleischer
 Hobart College: William C. Stiles
 Hofstra University: Philip R. Thiebert, P. Dalebrook
 Howard University: Leo F. Miles
 Hunter College: Richard C. Havel, Anthony Scolnick
 Indiana University: Herman L. Sledzik
 Ithaca College: Carlton Wood
 Jersey City State College: Tom M. Gerrity
 Juniata College: Walter Nadzak Jr.
 Lafayette College: Alan Kollevoll, H. Kissiah
 LaSalle College: John J. Conboy, Joseph P. Mooney
 Lehigh University: William B. Leckonby, Craig Anderson, Preston Parr
 Long Island College: Jerry Donner
 Lycoming College: David G. Busey
 Manhattan College: Kenneth A. Norton
 Mansfield State College: Arthur DeGenaro
 Maryland, University of, Eastern Shore: Leon N. Coursey
 Millersville State College: Lawrence A. McDermott
 Montclair State College: William P. Dioguardi
 Moravian College: Rocco J. Calvo
 Morgan State College: Embra C. Bowie, Earl O. Embree
 Muhlenberg College: Raymond J. Whispell
 New Paltz, State University College: William T. Odeneal
 New York, City College of: Robert M. Behrman
 New York University: Daniel E. Quilty, Larry Geraciotti, Miguel de Capriles
 Oswego, State University College: John V. Glinski
 Pace College: Peter X. Finnerty
 Pennsylvania, University of: Fred A. Shabel, Richard L. Corrigan
 Pennsylvania State University: John J. Coyle, Edward M. Czekaj, Robert J. Scannell, James I. Tarman
 Philadelphia College of Textiles and Science: Harry Pure
 Pittsburgh, University of: Harry Werner, Casimir J. Myslinski, Albert E. Smith, Walter Cummins
 Plattsburgh, State University College: Joseph C. Jastrab, Ernest P. Rangazas
 Potsdam, State University College: Samuel C. Molnar
 Princeton University: Sam Howell, Walter W. McCarthy
 Queens College: Robert J. Tierney
 Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute: Richard S. Lyon, Robert Ducatte
 Rider College: John B. Carpenter, A. F. Erfarth
 Rochester, University of: George Clemens
 Rochester Institute of Technology: Louis A. Alexander Jr.

Rutgers University: Mark Singley, Frederick E. Gruninger, Albert W. Twitchell
 St. John's University: Walter T. McLaughlin, John W. Kaiser
 St. Joseph's College: Michael J. Blee
 St. Lawrence University: Thomas A. Cartmill
 St. Peter's College: John A. Boland
 Scranton, University of: David R. Ocorr
 Seton Hall University: Richard J. Regan, John B. Duff
 Slippery Rock State College: Robert E. Raymond
 Southampton College: Allan Finger
 Stony Brook, State University College: Leslie F. Thompson
 Swarthmore College: Willis J. Stetson
 Syracuse University: Ron Oyer, Theodore C. Denise
 Temple University: Ernest C. Casale
 Thiel College: James L. McCoullough
 Union College: R. Bruce Allison
 U.S. Military Academy: John R. Jannarone, William J. Schuder
 U.S. Naval Academy: Capt. J. O. Coppedge
 Ursinus College: Everett M. Bailey
 Villanova University: Arthur L. Mohan
 Wagner College: Herbert E. Sutter
 West Virginia University: Herbert E. Warden, Leland Byrd, Red Brown
 Widener College: George A. Hansell
 William Paterson College: Arthur Eason, Robert Callahan

District Three

Alabama, University of: Willard F. Gray, Jefferson Coleman, Sam D. Bailey
 Alabama A&M University: George H. Hobson
 Alabama State University: Ulysses McPherson
 Appalachian State University: James F. Jones
 Auburn University: Charles F. Simmons, Lee R. Hayley
 Austin Peay State University: George Fisher, Leon Bibb
 Bellarmine College: David O'Toole
 Bowie State College: A. C. Jordan
 Catholic University: J. Brian McCall
 Citadel: Edward L. Teague, John E. Borrows
 Clemson University: Kenneth N. Vickery, H. C. McLellan
 Davidson College: John Bevan, Thomas Scott
 Delta State College: Horace L. McCool
 Duke University: Allan Kornberg, Carl James
 East Carolina University: Douglas R. Jones, Clarence Stasavich
 East Tennessee State University: Solon Gentry
 Eastern Kentucky University: Donald G. Combs
 Eckerd College: Dudley E. DeGroot
 Emory University: W. Clyde Partin
 Fayetteville State University: William M. Bell
 Fisk University: Herbert B. Thompson, Ben J. Pugh
 Florida, University of: Ray Graves, Mandell Glicksberg
 Florida A&M University: Alonzo S. Gaither
 Florida State University: Richard M. Baker Jr., G. Clayton Stapleton
 Florida Technological University: Frank D. Rohrer
 Furman University: J. Lyles Alley, Francis W. Bonner
 Gallaudet College: Wil Reynolds
 Georgia, University of: Joel Eaves, Reid Parker

Georgia Institute of Technology: William M. Sangster, John McKenna
 Georgia Southern College: James I. Clements Jr.
 Georgia State University: David C. Ewert
 Jacksonville University: Judson B. Harris Jr.
 Johns Hopkins University: Marshall S. Turner Jr.
 Kentucky, University of: W. L. Mathews, Harry Lancaster
 Kentucky State University: Brooks Giles Jr., William Exum
 Lane College: James A. Cooke
 Livingstone College: John D. Marshall II
 Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge: Carl Maddox, Paul Manasseh
 Loyola College: Emil G. Reitz Jr.
 Maryland, University of, Baltimore: James C. Mohr, E. Richard Watts Jr.
 Maryland, University of, College Park: John E. Faber
 Maryville College: Lauren Kardatzke
 Memphis State University: Ford Haynes Jr., Billy J. Murphy, William Marking
 Mercer University: J. Gerald Stone Jr.
 Miami, University of: Ernest B. McCoy, Harry C. Mallios
 Middle Tennessee State University: Charles M. Murphy, Morris F. Bass
 Mississippi, University of: Porter L. Fortune Jr., Richard E. Keye, Frank Kinard
 Mississippi College: John M. Williams
 Mississippi State University: Charles N. Shira
 Morehouse College: Arthur J. McAfee Jr.
 Morris Brown College: M. J. Powell Jr.
 Nicholls State University: Raymond E. Didier
 North Carolina, University of, Chapel Hill: E. M. Hedgpeth, Homer C. Rice, Bill Cobey Jr., Carl Blyth
 North Carolina, University of, Charlotte: Harvey F. Murphy, Thomas C. Turner
 North Carolina A&T State University: Curtis Graves, Calvin Irvin
 North Carolina Central University: James W. Younge, Irving McCollum
 North Carolina State University: Ralph Fadum, Frank Weedon, Robert S. Bryan
 Northeast Louisiana University: Marcus Mapp, Bill Beall, George T. Walker
 Northwestern Louisiana State University: George E. Doherty
 Old Dominion University: James Jarrett
 Richmond, University of: E. Sherman Grable, B. Frank Jones
 Roanoke College: Homer Bast
 Rollins College: Edward F. Danowitz, Joseph Justice
 Samford University: H. Evan Zeiger
 South, University of the: Walter D. Bryant Jr.
 South Alabama, University of: Melvin A. Lucas
 South Carolina, University of: William F. Putnam, Harold B. Hagan, Paul Dietzel, Ralph Floyd, Weems O. Baskin Jr.
 South Florida, University of: Richard T. Bowers
 Southeastern Louisiana University: Pat Kenelly
 Southern Mississippi, University of: J. Lloyd Milan, Reed Green
 Southwestern College: William R. Maybry
 Stillman College: Jesse Hosey
 Tampa, University of: A. J. Dielens

Tennessee, University of, Chattanooga: H. G. McDowell, Ron G. Ekerhardt
 Tennessee, University of, Knoxville: G. Robert Woodruff, Earl M. Ramer
 Tennessee, University of, Martin: Jack G. Mays, Robert Carroll
 Tennessee State University: Crawford B. Lindsay, Howard C. Gentry
 Tennessee Technological University: R. Hooper Eblen
 Towson State College: Thomas O. Meinhardt
 Tulane University: Hugh F. Rankin, Rix N. Yard
 Tuskegee Institute: H. Frank Leftwich Jr.
 Vanderbilt University-Peabody College: Rob Roy Purdy
 Virginia, University of: D. Alan Williams, Eugene F. Corrigan
 Virginia Military Institute: John G. Barrett, Tom Joynes
 Virginia Polytechnic Institute: Wilson B. Bell, W. B. Matthews
 Virginia State College: William M. Bennett
 Wake Forest University: Gene E. Hooks
 Washington College: Edward L. Athey
 Washington and Lee University: William D. McHenry
 Western Carolina University: Gurney Chambers, Bob Waters
 Western Maryland College: Richard A. Clower
 William and Mary, College of: Benard L. Carnevale

District Four

Akron, University of: Gordon K. Larson
 Alma College: Charles A. Gray
 Ashland College: Fred M. Martinelli, Betty Brodbeck, Robert Stokes
 Baldwin-Wallace College: Lee J. Tressel
 Ball State University: Warren VanderHill, John Reno, Raymond A. Louthen
 Bowling Green State University: Carl W. Hallberg, Richard A. Young, James E. Hof, Don A. Cunningham
 Butler University: Tom M. Warner, Joseph M. Nygaard
 Calvin College: Dave Tuuk
 Central Michigan University: Lester Serier, Ted Kjolhede
 Chicago University: Walter L. Hass
 Chicago State University: George Oberle
 Cincinnati, University of: George D. Smith
 Cleveland State University: Robert Bushey, Merle J. Levin
 Dayton University: Thomas J. Frericks, John E. McVay
 Denison University: LeRoy G. Seils
 DePaul University: Jack Lavin
 DePauw University: Robert D. Loring, Thomas A. Mont, James D. Loveless
 Eastern Illinois University: Peter R. Moody, Ronald Paap, Tom Katsimpalis
 Eastern Michigan University: George W. Linn, F. L. Ferzacca
 Evansville, University of: Ralph H. Coleman
 Hope College: Gordon M. Brewer
 Illinois, University of, Champaign: Henry S. Stillwell, Cecil Coleman, Richard P. Tamburo
 Illinois, University of, Chicago Circle: Edward L. Deam, Walter G. Versen, Samuel Donnelly, Bill Leach
 Illinois Institute of Technology: Edward W. Glancy
 Illinois State University: H. Twyman Jones, Milton E. Welsbecker
 Indiana Central College: William A. Bright, Robert M. Brooker

Indiana State University: Samuel W. Suttle, Gordon H. Chalmers
 Indiana University: J. William Orwig
 Iowa, University of: Robert F. Ray, Charles W. Elliott, George Wine, Willis Bright
 Kalamazoo College: Rolla L. Anderson
 Kent State University: Glenn W. Frank, Milo R. Lude
 Kenyon College: Phillip J. Morse
 Lake Forest College: Nick Wasylik
 Lake Superior State College: Ronald R. Cooper
 Loyola University: George M. Ireland, Wayne F. Tinkle
 MacMurray College: William L. Wall
 Marquette University: Samuel P. Saucedo
 Marshall University: Harold L. Willey, Edward M. Starling, Joseph H. McMullen
 Miami University: W. Fred Cottrell, Richard G. Shrider
 Michigan, University of: Donald B. Canham, Marcus L. Plant, Donald Lund
 Michigan State University: John A. Fuzak, J. Burt Smith
 Michigan Technological University: K. Ross Johnson
 Minnesota, University of, Duluth: Ralph A. Romano
 Minnesota, University of, Minneapolis: Max O. Schultze, Robert J. Geary, Paul R. Giel
 Monmouth College: Jack M. Steger
 Mount Union College: Jackson W. Rafeld
 Muskingum College: Edgar A. Sherman
 Northern Illinois University: Clyde C. Walton, Robert J. Brigham, Nye L. Lebow
 Northern Michigan University: Henry Helmonen, Gil Canale
 Northwestern University: Leon A. Bosch, Tippy Dye, Waldo A. Fisher, Steven Reid, Thomas J. O'Dea
 Notre Dame, University of: Edward W. Krause, Edmund Joyce, John J. Stephens
 Oakland University: Corey Van Fleet
 Ohio Northern University: Marvin V. English
 Ohio State University: Roy A. Laramie, Hugh Hindman, J. Edward Weaver, Wilbur E. Snyppe
 Ohio University: Fred Picard, William D. Rohr
 Ohio Wesleyan University: Robert M. Strimer
 Otterbein College: Robert Agler
 Purdue University: Roy L. Whistler, George S. King Jr.
 St. Cloud State College: George O. Erickson, Bob Peterson
 St. Joseph's College: Andrew G. Mehall
 Southern Illinois University, Carbondale: Don Boydston, Bill Brown
 Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville: Robert Guelker
 Toledo, University of: Edwin L. Saxer, Charles Snyder, Vernon M. Smith
 Valparaiso University: Richard P. Koenig, Emory G. Bauer
 Wabash College: Max E. Servies, Robert L. Henry
 Wayne State University: Vernon K. Gale, Chalmer G. Hixon
 Western Illinois University: Gil Peterson, James E. McKinney, Anthony J. Karas
 Western Michigan University: Leo Vanderbeck, Joseph T. Hoy, J. Patrick Clysdale
 Wheaton College: Robert L. Brabenec, Harvey C. Chrouser

Wisconsin, University of, Madison: Frank J. Remington, Elroy L. Hirsch
Coley
Wittenberg University: William Edwards
Wooster, College of: Robert M. Bruce
Wright State University: Gordon L. Wise
Xavier University: James M. McCafferty
Youngstown State University: Willard L. Webster

District Five

Augustana College: A. L. Sponberg
Bradley University: Charles K. Orsborn
Central Missouri State University: Floyd Walker
Colorado, University of: William H. Baughn, Edwin B. Crowder, Fred Casotti
Cornell College: William A. Deskin
Creighton University: Michael P. Sheridan
Drake University: Stuart C. Tiedeman, Robert D. Karnes
Iowa State University: John P. Mahabsted, Louis G. McCullough
Kansas, University of: Charles H. Oldfather Jr., Wade R. Stinson,
Jack Cherry
Kansas State University: C. Clyde Jones, Ernie D. Barrett
Lincoln University: Dwight T. Reed
Louisville, University of: Carl E. Abner
Mankato State College: James Otto
Missouri, University of: Henry T. Lowe, Mel R. Sheehan
Missouri, University of: Fred Thumlin, Charles Smith
Morningside College: R. D. Halford
Nebraska, University of: Keith L. Broman, Don Bryant
New Mexico State University: Carl R. Hall, Keith Colson
North Dakota, University of: Leonard R. Marti
North Dakota State University: Ronald P. Erhardt
North Texas State University: William A. Miller, Fred McCain
Northeast Missouri State University: John D. Black, James J. Dougherty
Northern Iowa, University of: Stan Sheriff, Jack Jennett
Northwest Missouri State University: Gladden Dye
Oklahoma City University: David Swank, John Keith
Oklahoma State University: Lloyd K. Musselman
Oklahoma State University: Raymond E. Chapel, Floyd Cass, Harvey L. Griffin, D. L. Cooper
Oral Roberts University: Jack P. Wallace, Lavoy Hatchett, Dwayne E. Roe

District Six

Alcorn A&M College: Marino H. Casem, Norris A. Edney
Arkansas, University of, Fayetteville: Albert M. Witte, George R. Cole
Arkansas, University of, Pine Bluff: Vannette W. Johnson
Arkansas State University: Sam R. Gennuso, Don Floyd

Baylor University: Edwin P. Horner, Jack Patterson
Centenary College: Orvis U. Sigler, Robert Deufel
Grambling College: Douglas T. Porter
Houston, University of: A. A. White, Harry H. Fouke
Houston Baptist College: William B. Crittenden, Ed S. Billings
Jackson State College: Martin L. Epps
Lamar University: James B. Higgins, Ed Eveland
Louisiana Tech University: Harold J. Smolinski, Maxie T. Lambright
McNeese State University: Jack V. Doland
Mississippi Valley State College: Silas Peyton, Davis Weatherby
Pan American University: John W. Hook, James A. Brooks
Rice University: Alan J. Chapman, Norman Hackerman, A. M. Bale
Southern Methodist University: Harold Jeskey, Dave Smith, Jim Brock
Southwestern Louisiana, University of: David H. Fisher, A. G. Urban
Texas, University of, Arlington: Claude R. Gilstrap, Richard J. Marquis
Texas A&M University: Charles H. Samson Jr., Marvin Tate
Texas Christian University: Kenneth Herrick
Texas Southern University: Rodrick Paige, William Glosson
Texas Tech University: Robert L. Rouse, J. F. King, J. William Davis,
Polk Robinson

District Seven

Arizona, University of: David Strack, Louis A. Myers
Arizona State University: V. Alonzo Metcalf, Fred L. Miller
Boise State College: Robert Cornell, Lyle H. Smith
Brigham Young University: Milton F. Hartvigsen, Stanley H. Watts
Colorado College: Gerald C. Carle
Colorado School of Mines: William E. Leckie
Colorado State University: Perry C. Moore, Harry E. Troxell
Denver University: E. Hoyt Brawner
Fort Lewis College: Joseph M. Pease
Gonzaga University: Larry Koentopp
Idaho University: Roland O. Byers, Edward T. Knecht
Idaho State University: Darold H. Chambers, Milton W. Holt
Montana, University of: Earl C. Lory, Jack Swarthout
Montana State University: Harry Cockrum, Tom Parac
New Mexico, University of: Joe E. Martinez, Pete McDavid
Northern Arizona University: Lyle L. Mullens, Norman B. Johansen
Northern Colorado, University of: Donald Chaloupka, Joe Lindahl
Regis College: Clarence H. Kellogg
Texas, University of, El Paso: Richard W. Burns, George C. McCarty
U. S. Air Force Academy: Col. Philip J. Erdie, Col. Frank E. Merritt,
Hal Bateman
Utah, University of: Robert W. Swenson, James R. Jack
Utah State University: Norman B. Jones
Weber State College: Dale L. Gardner, Milton C. Meacham
Wyoming, University of: Glenn J. Jacoby, Joseph R. Geraud, Bill Young

District Eight

California, University of, Berkeley: Robert F. Steidel Jr., David L. Maggard
California, University of, Davis: Hubert H. Heltman, Joe L. Singleton
California, University of, Los Angeles: Thomas L. Jacobs, J. D. Morgan
California, University of, Riverside: Franklin A. Lindeburg

California, University of, Santa Barbara: Stephen S. Goodspeed, Ed Swartz
 California State Polytechnic University, Pomona: Donald Warhurst, Barry Knight
 California State Polytechnic University, San Luis Obispo: Joe Harper
 Chico, California State University: Don Scott
 Fresno State University: J. Gene Bourdet, George F. Ilg
 Fullerton, California State University: Andrew F. Montana, Neale R. Stoner
 Hawaii, University of: Paul Durham
 Hayward, California State University: Alfred R. Mathews
 Long Beach, California State University: Clarence R. Bergland, James L. Comer, Kenneth E. North
 Los Angeles, California State University: John W. Hermann
 Nevada, University of, Las Vegas: Dallas W. Norton, Michael Drakulich
 Nevada, University of, Reno: Richard M. Trachok
 Northridge, California State University: Glenn W. Arnett, Arthur T. Taitt, Sam Winningham, Cliff Abel
 Oregon, University of: Wendell Basye, Norval Ritchey, Bill Landers
 Oregon State University: John R. Davis, James G. Barratt
 Pacific, University of the: Cedric W. Dempsey, Edward S. Betz
 Pomona-Pitzer Colleges: Edward W. Malan
 Portland, University of: Joe Etzel
 Portland State University: A. Scott Durdan, Roy L. Love
 Puget Sound, University of: Darrell G. Medcalf
 Sacramento, California State University: Donald E. Fuoss
 St. Mary's College: Donald J. McKillip
 San Diego State University: O. Kenneth Karr
 San Francisco, California State University: Donald L. Garrity
 San Jose, California State University: John Caine, Richard Post
 Santa Clara, University of: George P. Malley
 Seattle Pacific College: Wesley E. Lingren
 Sonoma, California State University: Carl Peterson
 Southern California, University of: E. John Larsen
 Stanford University: John W. Harbaugh, Joseph H. Ruetz
 Washington, University of: Harry M. Cross, Joe L. Kearney
 Washington State University: Edward M. Bennett, Ray Nagel

Associate Members

Pittsburgh, University of, Johnstown: C. Edward Sherlock, George R. Walter
 West Florida, University of: Luther Schwick
 Wisconsin, University of, Green Bay: Dean A. Austin

Allied Members

Atlantic Coast Conference: Robert C. James, Norvall Neve
 Big Eight Conference: Keith Broman, Charles M. Neinas, Jack McClelland
 Big Sky Conference: John O. Roning
 Big Ten Conference: Marcus L. Plant, Wayne Duke, John Dewey, K. L. Wilson
 California Collegiate Athletic Association: M. Edward Wagner
 Central Collegiate Conference: Robert D. Karnes
 Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association: William M. Bell

Eastern College Athletic Conference: Robert M. Whitelaw, Clayton Chapman, George R. Bisacca
 Far Western Conference: Everett F. Shelton
 Gulf State Conference: Stanley Galloway
 Indiana Collegiate Conference: John J. Hinga
 Mid-American Conference: Fred Jacoby, Jim Canfield
 Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference: LeRoy T. Walker
 Middle Atlantic Conference: Willis J. Stetson, Ernest C. Casale, Marshall S. Turner Jr.
 Midwest Collegiate Athletic Conference: William A. Deskin
 Missouri Intercollegiate Athletic Association: Roy F. Brown
 Missouri Valley Conference: A. M. Holmes
 New England Collegiate Athletic Conference: Herbert W. Gallagher, Russell Granger
 New England Small College Athletic Conference: R. Bruce Allison
 North Central Conference: Richard G. Koppenhaver
 Ohio Athletic Conference: Albert N. Smith, Robert M. Strimer, LeRoy G. Seils
 Ohio Valley Conference: Arthur L. Guepe
 Pacific Coast Athletic Association: Jesse T. Hill
 Pacific-8 Conference: Wiles Hallock
 Southeastern Conference: H. Boyd McWhorter, J. Cliff Harper
 Southern Conference: Francis W. Bonner, Douglas R. Jones, John G. Barrett, Lloyd P. Jordan, J. Dallas Shirley
 Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: C. Johnson Dunn
 Southland Conference: Dick Oliver
 Southwest Athletic Conference: Howard Grubbs, Wilbur Evans, Cliff Speegle
 Southwestern Athletic Conference: Charles D. Henry
 West Coast Athletic Conference: Wilfred H. Crowley
 Western Athletic Conference: Stan Bates
 Yankee Conference: Adolph W. Samborski

Affiliated Members

College Athletic Business Managers Association: William H. Aspinwall
 College Band Directors National Association: William Moffit
 Eastern Collegiate Judo Association: Dong Ja Yang
 National Fencing Coaches Association of America: Hugo M. Castello, Michael A. DeCicco
 National Football Foundation and Hall of Fame: Jimmie McDowell

Visitors

Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women: Laurie Mabry
 Bloomfield College: Michael Sabia
 Canadian Intercollegiate Athletic Union: Robert W. Pugh, Carl Totzke
 C. D. Chesley Company: C. D. Chesley
 Cotton Bowl Athletic Association: Field Scovell
 Eggers Partnership, New York: R. Jackson Smith
 Fiesta Bowl: John K. Reid
 Florida International University: Vaskin Badalow, Doyt L. Perry
 Gator Bowl Association: Ted Emery
 Liberty Bowl: A. F. Dudley
 Memphis Memorial Stadium: T. J. Foley Jr.
 National Athletic Steering Committee: Vannette W. Johnson

DELEGATES ORIENTATION SESSION

Thursday Morning, January 11, 1973

The Delegates Orientation Session of the Sixty-Seventh Annual Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association convened at 8:10 a.m. in the Red Lacquer Room of the Palmer House, Chicago, Illinois, Samuel E. Barnes, Secretary-Treasurer of the Association, presiding.

Chairman Barnes: This is not the opening session of the Convention, but is an opportunity for those institutions who are here for the first time to perhaps get a leg up on the other persons who will be coming in a little later.

The only intention we have this morning is to ease you in your transition from the quiet life of teaching or coaching to the more hectic life of dealing with NCAA matters. We are going to try to ease the burden by giving you an over-view of some of the things the NCAA is doing, trying to do, and with your help can do.

This morning we have three gentlemen who will touch upon three programs in the NCAA that are really the heart of our program.

I would like to introduce these gentlemen to you, one of whom is Bill Baughn, who is the faculty representative of the University of Colorado, Boulder, who will speak first because he has another commitment. However, the other two, Tom Hansen and Lou Spry, from the national office, will be here to answer questions. This is the procedure we will follow: Each individual will present his side of the story, and when he has completed that, we will ask that you withhold questions until all three of the speakers have finished and then you may direct questions to the individual by name.

I would like at this time to introduce to you Mr. William Baughn, faculty representative of the University of Colorado, Boulder, who will talk about the Long Range Planning Committee, Mr. Baughn.

William H. Baughn (University of Colorado): Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: I was asked to take just a few minutes this morning to review the work of the Long Range Planning Committee. This Committee is made up of two university or college presidents, four or five athletic directors, a conference commissioner, and two or three faculty representatives.

Fortunately, we have no on-going responsibilities; that is, we have no quasi-administrative duties. We don't have to make any rules for any athletic event. We don't have any infraction hearings. We don't have to negotiate any TV contracts. So sometimes we wonder what we are supposed to do.

One of our tasks is just that: to decide what all comes into the purview of this Long Range Planning Committee. Basically, the Committee is supposed to concern itself with things that will affect the long-run future of this Association, bringing items into focus, getting a handle on them, and getting them pointed in the right direction. These relationships involve both things internal to NCAA and the relationship between NCAA and our institutions as well as our various external publics.

NCAA Films Service: Richard Snider
NCAA Television Committee: Asa S. Bushnell
National Association of College Directors of Athletics: Michael Cleary
Nebraska, University of, Omaha: Clyde W. Biggers
Orange Bowl Committee: B. B. Benjamin, James S. Dunn, William D. Ward
Pasadena Tournament of Roses Association: Otis Blasingham, Raymond Dorn, Stanley Hahn, Lathrop Leishman, William H. Nicholas
Spencer Marketing Services: John F. Geis
Sugar Bowl: Capt. Joe T. Katz
Sun Bowl: Harrison D. Kohl
TVS Television Network: Eddie Einhorn
Washburn University: Michael Sarkesian
Wisconsin State University Conference: Max Sparger
Bob Bronzan, San Jose, California

Working News Media

Associated Press: Jerry Liska
Benagh, Jim: Free-lance journalist
Bloomington Courier-Journal: Bob Owens
Chicago Daily News: Tim Weigel
Chicago Tribune: Roy Damer, John Husar, Mike Conklin
Des Moines Register-Tribune: Buck Turnbull
Indianapolis Star: John Bansch
Kansas City Star: Bill Sims
Knoxville Sentinel: Tom Siler
Memphis Commercial-Appeal: Bobby Hall
Nashville Banner: Fred Russell
New York Times: Gordon White
Oklahoma City Oklahoman: Volney Meece
Orlando Sentinel: Bill Buckhalter
Orlando Star: Charlie Vasseur
Rochester Chronicle: David Warner
Salt Lake City Tribune: John Mooney
Sports Illustrated: Larry Keith, Rich Clarkson
Tucson Daily Citizen: Regis McCauley
Tupelo Journal: Bill Ross
United Press International: Ira Miller, Ed Sainsbury, Gene Bludeau
WGN-TV, Chicago: Jack Brickhouse, Don Gill
WHDH, Boston: Ned Martin
WLS-TV, Chicago: Duane Dow
WMAZ, Macon: Bobby Pope
WMAQ-TV, Chicago: Dennis Swanson
WSNS-TV, Chicago: Chris Steger

So what is long term, what is already someone else's business isn't easy to define. We receive suggestions, ideas, charges, references from the officers, from the Council, from any delegate who wants to bring things to our attention. The Committee itself sits back in its rocking chair and so often asks itself what is important, but we never know whether we are working on the right thing, and every once in a while we feel no one would miss us if we went out of business.

The method we use—the items that come before us are kicked around in the Committee. In other words, with this diverse makeup of the Committee, you have the opportunity to review things from several points of view. In many cases we will prepare discussion papers, opinion papers, position papers perhaps. We may do some research, survey members, survey special groups, or bring in specialists to talk with us and consult with other committees.

Our major purpose this morning is to let you know the Committee exists and ask you to bring things to the Committee that do need some attention; in other words, to keep eligibility at least in line with the current scene on the university campuses, such things as how credit is granted, how you handle pass-fail, pass-no-pass, how these changes are kept in line in our rules and regulations.

Such things as graduate participation—this comes up very often. We have had a fairly arbitrary rule that no graduate can participate in athletic events. We have come forward with a recommended change in that, a very minor modification. This has become legislation. We don't know whether we went far enough.

Club sports. This is a major area on our campuses. Many students take part in these events. Basic questions. Should the NCAA be involved in these at all? If so, in what way? If not, how can NCAA help its member institutions in coping with this rather growing area of club sports? In other words, suggested methods where institutions can exchange ideas, work together in making institutions aware of certain liabilities they have in club sports.

Women's participation in athletics. This is here. We face it. How? To what extent? What format? What alternatives do we have? We have been working with women's organizations, getting their points of view, and again certain recommendations have left our Committee, gone forward on this very important, shall we say, very timely topic.

Liaison with the higher education hierarchy in Washington. We believe this Association should keep close ties with the higher education groups in Washington, the ACE, the National Association of Universities, the Land-Grant Colleges and other aspects of higher education of which we are a part, rather than letting athletics go one way and the higher education hierarchy go another. So we have been trying to find ways to keep in good standing and good touch with these organizations.

Amateurism. This comes up at almost every meeting—levels of amateurism, differences among sports, cross-over between sports. If it is feasible to re-establish amateur status under certain conditions, and the whole bag of questions that are related to when an individual is in fact an amateur for our purposes, for our definition, and when he is not. We have rules on this now.

Many people are dissatisfied with many parts of this, and our problem is to get a handle on the right aspects of this, the reasonable aspects, to see if we can get something moving.

The legal problems. Sanctions against institutions and against individuals are being challenged in many different ways. These are complicated problems. What are the implications? What are our serious procedures, our penalty procedures? Will they hold up? To what extent and how? This is an area that is going to require substantial attention, and we simply at this time do not have a good handle on it.

The problem of image, of athletes and higher education. This has been brought to our attention by a number of different people in different ways. We talked about measuring it, the various publics, the students, the graduate students, faculty, alumni and general public. We backed away from trying to do any measurement because we simply feel at this point you may do more harm than good, but this is an area that many people in the Association think needs attention, not only measurement but doing something about it.

Such things as the organization of this Association. We have gone forward on a number of occasions with position papers on various aspects of organizational problems, who votes on what, the problems of the Council and its leadership role, the fact that infractions and hearings take so much of the Council's time—how much is left to devote to the business of the Association.

The whole problem of appellate procedures, whether we are organized properly to get these things done. We haven't arrived here. Some of the recommendations have been taken. Others are still being discussed. But this is an area we will spend a good deal of time on at this meeting.

Our relationships with junior colleges at the organizational level, not the institutional level.

How can we expand participation in sports on our campuses? We have large universities, small teams, and how do we as the NCAA provide an opportunity for participation?

The whole area of behavior of student-athletes. Different people have different feelings on what we should expect athletes to do on terms of personal behavior, and we have highly controversial discussions on this area.

The method of the Committee then. We deliberate ourselves. We prepare position papers, do all sorts of things to try to get it to the front burner, and come up with some definite recommendations and pass these along to the Council.

We have no authority ourselves. We cannot legislate anything. We do not prepare legislation. We pass it on to other committees, sometimes special committees, sometimes standing committees, and occasionally our ideas take hold and something is done. In some cases the recommendations of the committee go forward and stop there. It is a deliberative group, and we see the purpose of this Committee being primarily a hearing group that can take time to go into things.

As chairman of the Committee, I invite you to send along to us or to any member of the Committee or to an officer anything of this nature that you think needs to start in the hopper toward examination and toward discussion and toward legislation.

Chairman Barnes: Does anyone have a question he would like to ask Bill before he leaves?

The next individual is Tom Hansen, assistant executive director of the NCAA staff in Kansas City, who will talk to us about public relations.

Thomas C. Hansen (NCAA): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

In an association, whether it be athletics or otherwise, nearly every activity has some effect upon the public image and public relations of that body. This certainly is true in the NCAA, with the possible exception of our enforcement activities, and yet even enforcement serves the role of notifying the general public of the desire of colleges and universities to conduct their intercollegiate athletic programs by self-imposed regulations.

My role is to outline the problem of the Association in the area of "pure" public relations.

These NCAA activities usually are headed by one or two very active committees, the Public Relations Committee or the Promotion Committee. They are assisted by National Collegiate Sports Services, by its publishing service, its Official Film Service, and a number of executive office staff members.

Before talking about the Committees and the staff, let me review the considerable contributions of the New York, Phoenix and Wichita groups.

NCSS issues the weekly statistical rankings which are an essential part of college football, basketball and baseball. It maintains a myriad of records and publishes several records books. In addition, it provides information and services to the New York media. Jack Waters is the new director, succeeding Larry Klein, who left us this last summer to enter private business as a freelance writer. The NCSS has a staff of nine persons.

A key NCSS program of which you may not be aware is furnishing film on college sports to the news departments of the three television networks.

Every day each network feeds this footage electronically to its affiliated stations for their news programs. NCSS has games filmed, or special interviews conducted, processes and scripts the footage, then delivers the materials to the news departments. This is their only source of such footage, as college sports, unless your institution or conference should send something. I don't think that happens often.

The director of the program is Ron Schwartz, and he has won the respect of the networks who use a high percentage of what he provides, and even call on him for suggestions on what their own film crews should cover. The program concentrates on football but actually is carried the year round and covers all collegiate sports.

In Phoenix, College Athletics Publishing Service, under Homer Cooke, produces nine Guides and nine Rules Books annually. There is a staff of eight persons there.

The Official Film Service films six championship events each year, produces several fine shows for ABC, including the Sunday highlights show. It does other specialized filming for the NCAA, conferences, colleges and sponsors such as Chevrolet. The 1971 Basketball Championship film won a Golden Eagle as the best sports film produced in the United States that year.

In Kansas City, five staff members work in some phase of public relations. I am Television Program Director and work with legislative liaison and the Promotion Committee. Jerry Miles is director of public relations, working with the Public Relations Committee and such projects as the Media Seminar and the Honors Luncheon.

Dave Daniels edits the NCAA News. The NCAA News receives

high priority among all NCAA projects and has been increased several times recently in size and in frequency of publication. We rely on the News to keep the membership informed on many Association activities, and we try to keep up to date on your schedules.

Grayle Howlett is promotion director for the Association and works on the promotion of championships in assisting host institutions.

Ted Tow now edits the many publications issued by the executive office, and will become director of the Publishing Service in April, when it moves to the new headquarters building.

The Public Relations Committee not only advises the staff concerning all aspects of the PR program, but it is also directly responsible for the Media Seminar, the Football Program Feature Series and hosting the media at the Basketball Tournament.

Let me elaborate upon the Seminar.

Each year the Committee organizes this three-day, no-holds-barred, on-the-record session where top sports writers and sportscasters get to meet NCAA leaders and question them thoroughly. It has reduced confusion and increased respect for college athletes in the eyes of the news media, and has provided the leaders in the NCAA with a better understanding of the media's interests and misunderstandings.

The Committee also is responsible for NCAA advertising. We have had some trouble in that area and we have just retained a new advertising representative, Bassett Publishing Company of Chicago. The Committee recently produced a Public Relations Manual, which is a great asset to college sports information directors.

Each year since the 1969 Centennial season, the Promotion Committee has conducted a multi-media promotional campaign which is designed to promote college football. It is specifically designed to assist each member college in its own publicity, to get college football into the media prior to the season when the professionals might otherwise totally dominate the public's consciousness, to provide a residue of film and statistical information for use of writers and television during the season. We try to generate college football publicity during the period when you are selling season tickets.

The promotional projects of the Promotion Committee have included: the college football symbol; football billboards; television and radio shows, the summertime computer statistics program and stories which compared last year with the past ten years statistically and was used widely by columnists and writers, the annual football press kit, the player and coach TV slide programs, speakers' kit, sponsorship of a feature camera for the news film program which will let them do such things as concentrate on the centers and liaison with such sponsors as Chevrolet and other sponsors who are interested in a commercial tie-in or in buying time in college football.

In the near future the Promotion Committee plans to publish a Football Ticket Sales Manual, and to fund a production by the Public Relations Committee for a Freshman Athlete's Manual.

Efforts began this summer on basketball promotion. We produced six short films and four strictly promotional messages. The short films concentrated upon officiating and sportsmanship, which I believe is an area that needs greater attention. The initial response has been very good. The films are designed for use in your conference basketball programs and individual telecasts.

I would echo, in closing, what has been said by the previous speaker,

that we solicit your ideas. We cannot sit in Kansas City and effectively do what you need to have done to promote your programs unless we hear from you, and we welcome and encourage your ideas at all times.

Chairman Barnes: The next speaker is Lou Spry, assistant executive director, who will talk on championship events.

Louis Spry (NCAA): Thank you, Sam. I appreciate this opportunity to discuss the championship events program. The Association's 29 championship events are under the direct supervision of the appropriate meet or tournament committees, whose policies and procedures are subject to the approval of the NCAA Executive Committee.

National championships are sponsored for both University Division and College Division members in 10 sports including baseball, basketball, cross country, golf, gymnastics, soccer, swimming, tennis, outdoor track and wrestling.

As most of you know, Bylaw 4-6-(a) requires each member institution to declare its program, either University Division or College Division, in the above 10 sports. This competitive designation does not apply in the sports of fencing, hockey, lacrosse, skiing, indoor track, volleyball or water polo. Consequently, all member institutions are eligible for these seven national collegiate championships.

The final two programs in our total of 29 are the regional championships in College Division football which are conducted in two divisions. Saturday this Convention will consider amendments to establish two national championship tournaments in football for College Division members.

The responsibilities of the NCAA executive office, in regard to championship events, are handled primarily by four persons. General supervision of the events program and liaison between the meet and tournament committees and the Executive Committee are my chief responsibilities.

Responsibility for the day-to-day operation of meets and tournaments rests with Tom Jernstedt, director of events, the former assistant athletic director of the University of Oregon, who was just hired this last summer. Tom Combs, events manager, processes the financial reports, orders awards, and attends to other administrative details. Finally, promotion of NCAA championships is the responsibility of Grayle Howlett.

If you are hosting an NCAA championship or desire information on entry or selection, please do not hesitate to contact our office. Mr. Jernstedt or Mr. Combs will be happy to answer any general questions you may have. Specific assignments in regard to championships are as follows: College Division basketball and the College World Series are in my bailiwick. Mr. Combs handles College Division baseball, and Mr. Jernstedt is responsible for the remaining events including the National Collegiate Basketball Championship.

The prime objective of the Executive Committee and the Events Department is to conduct the best possible meet or tournament. That means a soundly administered championship with the broadest possible participation while maintaining a high level of quality.

Most individual championships are open to all comers; however, many require qualification or attainment of a prescribed standard to be eligible to enter. Without exception, entries in team championships are determined by qualification or invitation. It is the latter procedure

which causes most of the controversy regarding the championship program.

The various tournament committees follow myriad procedures in selecting teams; however, I believe the following guidelines are applicable to all:

First and probably most important is won-and-lost record.

An extremely close second is strength of schedule.

These two items are so closely regarded that it probably is unfair to suggest that one is considered ahead of the other.

Eventually, each committee is forced to choose between two or more teams for one berth in the tournament, leaving many coaches, players and followers disappointed.

A third consideration of selection committees is eligibility of student-athletes for postseason competition. This factor further complicates the lives of selection committee members. Imagine, if you will, trying to choose between two basketball teams, one with 17-9 record and all players eligible—the second with a mark of 20 wins and six losses, but one of its starting guards is not eligible for the tournament. As you may imagine, many committees have been impaled upon the horns of similar dilemmas.

Many times selection committees will appoint advisory committees to survey the teams within a given district or region. Teams are then rated according to their strength, usually on a telephone conference call, and eventually the final selections are made via the same process.

In the vast majority of instances, selection committees will follow the recommendations of their advisory committees; however, occasionally such is not the case usually resulting in criticism of the committee.

All members of the Association's meet and tournament committees are nominated by the Committee on Committees and elected by the Annual Convention.

All advisory and selection committees are required to replace any member whose team is being considered for selection. In this way, we feel the committee will act in a more objective manner.

As you know, the vast majority of NCAA competition is conducted on campus with member institutions serving as host for the meet or tournament. The Association does have several contracts with outside agencies to conduct championships. In most instances, the sponsoring agencies are required to expend their funds for educational or charitable purposes within the local community.

I would like to encourage each delegate to this convention to contact our office in the event your institution is interested in hosting an NCAA championship. It is important that the membership continues to support the Association's championships in this manner to the benefit of all institutions.

The 1971-72 academic year was a most successful one for the NCAA championships. Participation and attendance were excellent. Approximately 8,200 athletes competed in the championship events program. Fourteen hundred institutions were represented, or an average participation in more than two events by each member institution. More than 555,000 spectators paid to see NCAA competition during 1971-72.

The 28 championships conducted during 1971-72 grossed \$3.2 million dollars, including television revenue of slightly more than \$1 million. More than one-half of gross receipts was generated by the National

Collegiate Basketball Championship, which incidentally in 1972 was under the direct supervision of Tom Hansen, who just spoke.

I am sure you will be interested in the disposition of the aforementioned gross receipts. First, 24 per cent was disbursed by the host institutions or sponsoring agencies to pay game expenses. Next, 46 per cent was paid to competing teams in the form of travel expenses and distributions of net receipts. Two per cent was paid to sponsoring agencies in accordance with existing contracts, and the remaining 28 per cent accrued to the general operating budget of the Association.

Chairman Barnes: I assume from your silence you have no questions.

In fifteen minutes the Sixty-Seventh Convention will open. Please return by 9 a.m.

[The session adjourned at 8:45 a.m.]

OPENING BUSINESS SESSION

Thursday, January 11, 1973

The opening business session of the Sixty-Seventh Annual Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association convened in the Red Lacquer Room of the Palmer House, Chicago, Illinois, at 9:10 a.m., Earl M. Ramer, NCAA President and professor of education at the University of Tennessee, presiding.

1. OPENING REMARKS

[President Ramer introduced the members of the NCAA Council, Executive Committee, as listed on pages 5-7.]

President Ramer: Let me suggest that we now discuss briefly and informally a number of our program aspects and features.

Registration continues through today on this floor until 5 p.m. and through tomorrow until 5 p.m. Indeed, registration is available even on Saturday.

Let me remind you of the importance of the round table, the combined round table scheduled for this afternoon in this room, 2 to 5 p.m., "Presentation and Discussion of Proposals on Reorganization."

Members of the Convention, I know that you agree with me that the proposals concerning reorganization are among the more important matters presented to the Association in the history of our organization. That importance stands, I think, whatever your attitude toward these reorganization proposals. These proposals are designed to assist the Association in accommodating itself to the needs and interests of the varieties of institutions in our membership.

I need not emphasize to you that the reorganization proposals are complicated in some ways. We need the fullest study and discussion of these proposals, as we approach the final business session and the voting on these proposals tomorrow afternoon. Let me encourage you, therefore, to attend the round table this afternoon, to participate fully, and if there are any of those points at which there seems to be difficulties of interpretation, voice your question so the committee members leading in the round table this afternoon may assist us in whatever understanding may be necessary. Members of the committee, you will note, are those making presentations this afternoon and responding to questions.

I should add that Council members feel that since financial aid proposals have been discussed previously, since these proposals over a period of nearly two years now have been presented to you in writing for study and discussion at home and in the Convention, our attention in the round table this afternoon to reorganization should take precedence over our attention to the financial need proposals. Nevertheless, we have the financial need proposals indicated for possible treatment this afternoon in the round table, as you will note.

I should emphasize in the same breath with my emphasis upon the round table meetings the district meetings being held from 9:30 to 11:30 a.m. tomorrow. One correction, please, District 3 will not meet in Private Dining Room 18, as indicated in your schedule and pro-

gram, but will be meeting in the Red Lacquer Room. You will have opportunities in these district meetings not only to promote further our understanding and clarification of proposals before us in this Convention, but also opportunity, I think, to refine and coordinate our regional interests in these matters. These district meetings will be conducted under the chairmanship of the appropriate district vice-presidents. Representatives from the Executive Offices in Kansas City will be present at these meetings to assist in any way that may seem appropriate in the discussions or proceedings.

I hope that you will remember also the Honors Luncheon program at noon tomorrow. We have reason to take pride in the Honors program ceremonies. You have received or will receive tickets at your registration. We will be honoring at that time, as you know, postgraduate scholarship winners, College Athletics Top Ten and the recipient of the seventh Theodore Roosevelt Award, General Bradley.

The final business session of the Association will begin at 3 p.m. tomorrow in this room, continuing until 6 p.m., and will continue through Saturday until 5 p.m., our adjournment time for the convention.

Perhaps I should comment briefly on the order of business. After the preliminary reports, we will bring to the convention floor other committee reports that you will find in the annual report bulletin, 1971-72, that you should have in your possession. We will bring also to this meeting this morning the report of the Television Committee from the meeting as projected tomorrow afternoon, and one additional report, the report of the National Policy Board for Legislative Representation.

After these presentations, we will move to our consideration of Amendments 1 through 14. Concluding our treatment of these amendments this morning, we will conclude the opening session with the report of our Memorial Resolutions Committee.

Friday afternoon, in the beginning of our so-called Final Business Session, 3 to 6 p.m., we will give our attention to Amendments 15 through 38, and on Saturday morning, Amendments 39 through 102, and then Executive Regulations 103 through 108, carrying on into Saturday afternoon.

In the happy circumstance that we are able to complete our agenda to Amendment 38 tomorrow afternoon prior to adjournment time, we may possibly make the proposal that two or three of the amendments from Saturday be brought before our consideration at that time. That is, prior to adjournment tomorrow afternoon. This would be done, of course, with the consent and only with the consent of the Convention.

In the event that we complete the morning's agenda prior to 12:15, no attempt will be made to bring amendments now scheduled for Friday or Saturday to the floor of the convention. We feel that a number of good reasons justify that decision, and I will not go into those at this time.

In the unhappy circumstance that projected adjournment times or recess times find our attention to the agenda to be incomplete, we will face the problem then, and I will not discuss that unhappy possibility or the possibility of that unhappy circumstance now. I might add

one word of encouragement. Last year many of us felt we would never get through the agenda. We did, as a matter of fact, adjourn at ten minutes to 5 p.m. Let us hope we may be able to complete the entire program of proposals by adjournment time at 5 o'clock Saturday afternoon.

Now we move to the agenda for the morning session. The first, the appointment of special committees. I refer you to the Nominating Committee, under the chairmanship of Louis Myers of Arizona. This committee for weeks now has been receiving suggestions from the membership. This committee will be meeting Friday, beginning at 7:45 p.m. The committee that evening will be determining nominations for the Presidency, the position of Secretary-Treasurer, and certain vice-presidents and at-large members of the Council. If you have suggestions for that committee let me strongly urge you to communicate with Dr. Myers or one of the other committee members.

The Committee on Committees, chairman, Karl Kurth, Jr., is concerned with nominations for the Rules and Tournament Committees. The Committee on Voting is under the chairmanship of Thomas J. Frericks. Finally, the Committee on Memorial Resolutions that will report later this morning is under the chairmanship of Edwin P. Horner.

I am happy at this time to ask our parliamentarian, Professor Marcus Plant, to discuss with us the voting procedures for the Convention, the procedures through which amendments to the amendments may be made and the manner in which participation on the floor of this convention should be anticipated.

2. EXPLANATION OF VOTING PROCEDURES

Marcus L. Plant (University of Michigan): Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen: With respect to voting, each active member and each allied member is entitled to one vote; and the voting member should be registered at the time of registration and designated.

The constitutional amendments and official interpretations relating to the Constitution require a two-thirds vote for approval. The Bylaws proposals to amend the Bylaws and official interpretations relating to them require a majority vote.

There are four possible methods of voting. There is the voice vote on matters where that is appropriate. We have in the past used the standing vote, but you have been furnished with voting paddles, and that will be the method by which we will vote when a count is in order. It is also possible to have a ballot vote, and it is also possible, although I cannot recall recently our having had a roll call vote. All those methods are available.

If reorganization passes on Friday, the plan then is that the members in the two divisions will receive paddles of different colors; and when a provision comes before the group which requires divisional voting, the persons in that division will vote by using the paddles of the color identified with that division. We will not separate, provisions provide that we should remain together; but with the different colored paddles, it has seemed to the Council and the officers it would be quite feasible to have separate voting, even though we were all in the same room, and have an efficient counting of them.

With respect to amendments to the amendments, the Constitution and the Bylaws each contain a provision which puts a limitation upon

the amendments that may be proposed here to the proposed amendments; and the limitation contains a special provision that the amendment is in order provided it does not increase the modification of the constitutional or Bylaw provision to be amended. That is rather peculiar language, but what it is intended to say is that a proposal is not in order to amend a proposed amendment if it expands the scope of it. An illustration that is sometimes given is that if the proposal is to raise the dues by \$10, it is in order to propose an amendment to change it to \$7; but it is not in order to propose an amendment to change it to \$12. Not all proposals work out quite that simply, but that is the general idea underlying the limitation.

I should have emphasized that there is an additional provision on proposals to amend the proposals before the convention. They must be filed with the Secretary before 1 p.m. on the day preceding the final business session, and that is today. That is, if you have proposed amendments to the amendments, they should be filed in the office with the Secretary by 1 p.m. today.

The Council may propose amendments to amendments without that limitation, but amendments coming from other sources have that deadline.

In discussion and debate, it is requested that each member who wishes to address the group approach one of the microphones. There is supposed to be one conveniently located, and each member is to give his name and the university or college with which he is associated. Our reporter is making a transcript of all the discussion, and your name should be mentioned each time that you rise to speak because she is not in a position to remember you from one time to another.

3. FURTHER EXPLANATION BY THE PRESIDENT

President Ramer: Thank you, Marc. Marc, please correct me on what I am about to say. Under the sequence of proposals that you find, divided voting—that is, voting by division—cannot be contemplated before Saturday morning.

Now, in the event that reorganization as proposed or modified is approved and we enter voting on a divided basis Saturday morning, we will make further reference to the mechanics for that voting at that time.

For the reports of the Rules and Meet or Tournament Committees, it is customary in a convention not to read these reports. You will have them available to read at your leisure. The custom further is to move acceptance of these reports as presented in this annual publication. Do I hear a motion for approval?

[Motion was regularly made, seconded and carried.]

4. REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-TREASURER

Samuel Barnes (District of Columbia Teachers College): Mr. President and gentlemen: The Constitution of this Association provides that the Secretary-Treasurer shall submit to this Annual Convention a report of all receipts and disbursements during the preceding fiscal year which ended August 31, 1972. In addition to this financial report, I shall provide information related to the status of the NCAA's membership.

Francis A. Wright and Company, Kansas City, Missouri, a firm of Certified Public Accountants, has completed an audit and submitted

a report of the Association's financial condition for the period beginning September 1, 1971 and terminating August 31, 1972. In addition to examining the report of the NCAA audit, you will be interested in the supplemental audit report concerning the financial operations of the National Collegiate Sports Services, in New York City, and the College Athletics Publishing Service in Phoenix.

For the 1971-72 fiscal year, the NCAA's total assets amounted to \$1,846,416.85 as compared to assets of \$1,692,483.24 for the previous fiscal year, an increase amounting to \$153,933.61. The increase in assets can be attributed to an increase in the cash on hand and an increase in the value of the Association's investments. No change was reflected in the investment in the National Collegiate Realty Corporation.

General income for 1971-72 amounted to \$1,344,716.56 as contrasted to general income of \$1,111,006.72 in 1970-71. General operating expenses for the 1971-72 fiscal year amounted to \$1,092,893.35 as against \$799,700.04 in 1970-71. Although NCAA championship events enjoyed fine attendance and excellent income during 1971-72, the major part of the increased income developed from the fact that for the first time football television monies were channeled into the NCAA's general income. In addition, the income from investments increased during the 1971-72 fiscal year. Increases in expenses for 1971-72 can be attributed to the inclusion for the first time of a grant to the National Collegiate Sports Services and a reserve for post-graduate scholarships in the NCAA's general budget. In addition, expenses were increased as a result of general inflationary pressures and additions to the executive staff. Including the NCAA, NCSS, CAPS and NSYSP operations, the executive office handled a cash flow of approximately \$6,700,000 during the 1971-72 fiscal year.

As of December 1, 1972, the new building was approximately 80 per cent complete, with the investment, (construction cost) exclusive of land, amounting to approximately \$915,000.00. This building is a most attractive structure in a very highly desirable location and promises to be a decided tangible asset to this Association. Completion is scheduled for April 1, 1973.

Your Association continues to grow and I am pleased to report that as of December 28, 1972, the membership totaled 770. Included in this total are 664 active, 45 allied, 31 associate and 30 affiliated members.

New members which have joined the Association within the past year are as follows:

ACTIVE MEMBERS

District One

Keene State College
Maine Maritime Academy
Curry College
Franklin Pierce College
Nathaniel Hawthorne College

District Two

Carnegie-Mellon University
Morris Harvey College
Bernard M. Baruch College
Allentown College of Saint Francis de Sales

Mansfield State College
Edinboro State College

District Three

Columbus College
Western Carolina University
Florida Technological University
Augusta College

District Four

University of Wisconsin, Whitewater
Wright State University

District Eight

California State College, Bakersfield

ASSOCIATE

Valdosta State College
Sangamon State University
University of North Florida
Florida International University

ALLIED

Eastern Intercollegiate Baseball League
New England Small College Athletic Conference
New England University Wrestling Association
New Jersey State College Athletic Conference

AFFILIATED

College Band Directors National Association
Conference Sports Information Directors of America
Eastern Collegiate Judo Association
National Athletic Steering Committee
Mid-West Officials Association.

Mr. President, this concludes the report of the Secretary-Treasurer, including the printed audit; and I move that it be received.

[The motion was seconded, put to a vote and carried.]

5. REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Wayne Duke (Big Ten Conference): Mr. President and members of the Association: The Executive Committee, elected annually by the Association's Council, consists of seven members plus the NCAA President, the Secretary-Treasurer and the Vice-President-at-Large. The Committee meets three times each year—January, April and August—to administer the Association's business and financial affairs, including the conduct of the National Collegiate and National College Division Championship Events.

The activities and functions of the NCAA continue to increase and again the Executive Committee urges the membership to look to the NCAA News for general information and official actions, including official interpretations of NCAA rules. Now operating on a stepped-up publication format, the News makes readily available to member institutions timely and up-to-date information. It is an excellent source of valid information concerning Association activities.

The statistical review of the 1971-72 academic year reflects membership growth, sports sponsorship and participation in NCAA championship events. Also included is a comparative analysis of 1970-71

and 1971-72 income from NCAA championship events. Your Executive Committee urges you to examine these reports.

In January 1972 the Executive Committee authorized the Building-Investment Committee to act for it in considering, reviewing and accepting bids for the construction of the new headquarters building. The contract was let to the Miller-Stauch Construction Company, Kansas City, Kansas, and work began during the last week in February. As of January 1, 1973, the building was approximately 80 per cent complete and will be ready for occupancy shortly after April 1, 1973. Although authorized to sell \$100,000.00 securities from the NCAA Investment Account and utilize the proceeds for building financing, the Building-Investment Committee determined that because of the favorable interest rate available on a bank loan, the Association would profit by retaining the \$100,000.00 in securities and related return and increasing the bank loan by \$100,000.00.

In early 1972, the Association entered into a two-year contract with ABC for televising college football games under the terms and conditions of the plan overwhelmingly approved by the membership. Under the terms of this contract, ABC makes an annual payment of \$13,490,000.00 as compared to \$12,000,000.00 paid in 1970 and 1971. From this amount College Division football receives \$240,000.00, and four other NCAA championship events receive a total of \$80,000.00.

Reference is made to the sale of television rights to the National Collegiate Basketball Championship. For the tournament of 1973, NBC will pay a rights fee of \$1,125,000.00 and for 1974 will pay \$1,200,000.00. These rights fees represent an increase of more than 70 per cent over the fee received for the 1972 tournament. In addition, TVS, Inc. has agreed to pay a television rights fee of \$65,000.00 in 1973 and 1974 for all first-round games and all regional games not selected for television by NBC. The television rating of the 1972 championship game was the highest of all time.

In March 1972, Eugene Duffy, Assistant Executive Director and valued employee, passed away. His outstanding service and dedication to the Association are reflected by the esteem in which he was held by his fellow workers and friends throughout intercollegiate athletics. With Mr. Duffy's passing, Louis J. Spry was named as Assistant Executive Director with responsibilities in the area of championship events and general administration. Thomas W. Jernstedt, Athletic Business Manager, University of Oregon, was employed as director of events. Succeeding Nels Jensen as editor of the NCAA News was Dave R. Daniel, who came to the Association from his post as assistant sports editor of the Pomona, California Progress-Bulletin. Added to the enforcement staff were William B. Hunt, member of the sports staff of the Corpus Christi Caller-Times, and Lester J. Burks, Executive Director, Kansas City Boys Club. Scheduled to report January 29, 1973, to assume the position of publications editor is Carl Eugene Jacobs, presently employed as news director at Fort Hays Kansas State College.

The National Summer Youth Sports Program enjoyed a most successful operation during the 1972 summer. Participating in the program were 104 institutions located in 70 cities within 34 states and the District of Columbia. Actual participants in the program, which was a joint undertaking involving the United States Government,

the sponsoring institutions and the NCAA, numbered 40,000 young people. The total cost of the 1972 program was \$4,937,869.00 with the Federal Government contributing \$2,977,500.00; the participating institutions \$1,784,644.00; private organizations, business, state and local governments \$90,725.00 and the NCAA \$55,000.00. The status of the NSYSP for 1973 can be described as follows:

Congress has appropriated funds for the continuation of the Office of Economic Opportunity programs which includes any funds to be earmarked for the NSYSP. The Office of Management and Budget determines the priorities of the various OEO programs; and once these decisions are made, NCAA will be advised as to the 1973 status of NSYSP. It is hoped that the NSYSP can be continued.

In November 1972 the first National College Division Soccer Championship was played with Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville, serving as host institution. Despite most adverse weather conditions, the championship tournament was successful and exceedingly well managed.

Mr. President, this concludes the report of the Executive Committee; and I move its acceptance and approval, including the detailed accounting of our activities as recorded in the 1971-72 Annual Reports.

[The motion was seconded, put to a vote and carried.]

6. REPORT OF THE COUNCIL

Louis A. Myers (University of Arizona): Mr. President and gentlemen: It is my privilege to represent the NCAA Council in presenting this year-end report. I am particularly pleased to present this year's record because I think it is a good one. It was necessary to conduct a record-number of meetings during 1972 because of two principal reasons—first, the increased workload brought on by an expanded and a more aggressive enforcement program, and secondly, consideration and preparation of proposed programs which a substantial segment of our membership, during the past two years, has been urging us to present for legislative action.

At the conclusion of my supplementary remarks I will move for acceptance and approval of this record except for those interpretations which may be included in the Convention Program under legislative proposals. I am sure most of you are familiar with our procedure whereby the Council is authorized to adopt interpretations of NCAA legislation during the course of the year, and these interpretations are binding after circularization to the membership. A member, of course, may request that the interpretations be reviewed by this Convention.

Here are some of the major points which the Council would like to mention, supplementing the written record.

Enforcement

During the past year, considerable attention has been directed towards the Association's enforcement program, both from within and outside of the NCAA membership. The Council has recognized a need for an aggressive effort at the national level to enforce the governing rules and regulations, and accordingly has taken several steps to accomplish this objective.

In emphasizing its commitment to a strong enforcement program, the Council authorized, and has subsequently so accomplished in several cases, the imposition of more severe penalties in an effort

to deter possible violations. Severe penalties will continue to be imposed upon members when called for; and where possible and appropriate, institutions will be required to show cause why severe or additional penalties should not be imposed for failure of the institution to take appropriate disciplinary action against institutional representatives willfully involved in violations.

An effort has been made to expand the NCAA enforcement staff through the addition of two new full-time investigators bringing to four the total full-time employees in the enforcement area.

There has been significant progress made in the enforcement program since its establishment in 1952. However, it is the Council's opinion that now as never before there exists a need for the NCAA, its member institutions and allied conferences to strengthen their enforcement procedures. This need is based upon reports from the membership, individuals associated with intercollegiate athletics and the news media which have recently brought considerable attention to alleged rule violations. In an effort to improve the enforcement programs of the NCAA and allied conferences, and to give attention to the need for greater compliance with governing legislation, the Council sponsored a Conference of Conferences during July which was attended by representatives of 23 allied conferences, 10 affiliated members and three other related organizations. The ideas developed during this Conference have been and will continue to be considered by the Council and the Committee on Infractions in striving to improve the NCAA enforcement program. A copy of the summary of proceedings from the Conference is available from the NCAA executive office upon request.

Before this Convention are proposals for the revision of the Association's enforcement procedures. The Council, in endorsing these proposals, is of the firm conviction that the resultant changes are most necessary to help meet in the future the objective of an efficient and meaningful enforcement program. The significant proposed changes are: (1) the Committee on Infractions will be expanded from three to five members and empowered to hear infractions cases, make findings of violations and impose penalties; (2) the NCAA Council will become involved in the enforcement proceedings only if an institution appeals any findings of fact or the Committee's recommended penalty; (3) the NCAA enforcement staff, under the general guidance of the Committee on Infractions, will serve as an information-gathering agency and present alleged violations to the Committee, it being understood that the Committee will not become involved in the actual investigation of member institutions, and (4) the penalty structure will be revised to permit the NCAA to impose penalties, primarily through an institutional show-cause approach on institutional employees, student-athletes and representatives of an institution's athletic interests. The Council would like to emphasize that a revision of the enforcement program is necessary to speed up processing of infractions cases, relieve the NCAA Council of the excessive workload of considering infractions cases and, at the same time, provide for an appellate procedure.

With the planned increased emphasis on the enforcement program and the resultant penalties which obviously will result, the Association undoubtedly will be subject to increased pressures, including

legal action or the threat thereof, from parties directly involved. The Council will remain steadfast in its position that such pressures, or the threat thereof, will not deter the NCAA from adopting and applying governing legislation which is educationally sound in its purpose and in the best interests of intercollegiate athletics.

Governmental Relations

The trend toward greater effect of government upon all facets of American life was notable in amateur athletics during the past year. Sports bills were being introduced and speeches made constantly at all levels of government. The Council has favored vigorous defense of the interests of the membership of this Association, most often in concert with other school-college elements. Considerable effort has been expended, primarily by the Joint Legislative Committee for Athletics and Education. Through that body, the NCAA has joined the high schools and junior colleges in communicating policies, programs and desired goals to legislators. The Chairman of that body, Robert C. James, will report further on its busy year later in this session.

The Council judged the 1972 efforts of the Joint Committee as thorough and effective. It may be summarized here that every indication points to the necessity of a continuing strong defense and for an occasionally vigorous offense in the legislative area. The Council intends to support and assist the representatives of this Association engaged in this important activity. It earnestly solicits similar cooperation from each members institution or group.

Television

By every yardstick, 1972 was a most successful year for the Association's television programs. First, a new contract was signed with ABC-TV whereby football television is to bring the membership more than \$13 million during both the 1972 and 1973 seasons. Of that amount, record figures of \$240,000 and \$80,000 respectively are to go each year to the College Division I bowl games and the four championship events to be televised under terms of the Television Plan.

Then, in April, agreement was reached with NBC-TV for telecasting the 1973 and 1974 National Collegiate Basketball Championships for a substantially increased rights fee.

During the football season itself, the second highest ratings in history were achieved; more teams made appearances on more different types of telecasts than ever before; and every commercial position was sold for the entire season. That is an enormously important endorsement of college football. ABC-TV continued its excellent production of the colorful college games. The new Television Plan worked well and appears to achieve a balance in television control beneficial to most members of the Association. The new flexibility in scheduling caused no serious administrative problems.

Public Relations

The Council considers the primary objective of the Association's public relations efforts to be to communicate as totally as possible information on the NCAA's numerous activities both to the membership and to the general public through the nation's media.

One has only to multiply the 27 annual championship events by the number of NCAA committees times the number of legislative proposals facing this Convention to assess the magnitude of that task.

Yet the Council feels the Association is working diligently and effectively to convey the information desired, even to the point where it may generate an overload of material.

The key to the effort is the publication of the NCAA News, an information-laden document. Reading it carefully enables anyone to stay well informed on the NCAA. The News is augmented by many publications issued by the executive office, the publishing service and even the service bureau. More recently, such items as television promotional messages, football press kits, program feature series and program articles, a slide service and specially produced films have been added. In addition, there are the productions of the Official Film Service. More routine, but basic elements of the overall program, are the steady flow of press releases to the media, frequent press conferences, daily responses to media inquiries, the weekly statistics in football, basketball and baseball, and grants to affiliated organizations to support specialized publications.

The Council is dedicated to this program of full information with the conviction that the story and conduct of intercollegiate athletics are meritorious, and will earn the support of fair-minded persons who are well informed.

Drug Education

The Association should be especially proud of the activities of its Drug Education Committee under the chairmanship of Bob Pritchard of Worcester Tech. A tremendous amount of information concerning effects of drug usage has been distributed to the nation's colleges, junior colleges and high schools. Although the Committee's budget is not large, it has been enhanced considerably by a \$30,000 contribution from the Fiesta Bowl Association. Also aiding the Drug Education Committee in its work has been the Federal Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs.

NAIA Relations

More than 18 months ago, three representatives of the NCAA met with a like number from the NAIA for the purpose of discussing differences between the two organizations. Since the May 1971 meeting, no action has been forthcoming from the NAIA; and the Council stands ready to continue the discussions if the NAIA gives any indication that it is interested in doing so.

Olympics

Acting upon the unanimous recommendation of the NCAA International Relations Committee, the Council voted to discontinue the Association's membership in the U. S. Olympic Committee.

All of you have received the 31-page report of the International Relations Committee, titled "United States Olympic Crisis—The Problem That Won't Go Away." The record, it seems to us, is indelibly clear that our governing Olympic structure must be rebuilt. Our Olympic management is based upon a structure which was designed more than 50 years ago, and U.S. Olympic successes have been made possible by our abundance of athletic resources and assuredly not by the type of management that our best athletes deserve.

The Council voted to withdraw because of the conviction that this would trigger the necessary activity to bring about the necessary changes. We have been pleased by the support for this action through withdrawal actions of many college conferences, the stated support of

media representatives and the public at large, as well as positive indications that machinery will be put into motion—either through presidential executive action or Congressional action—to develop a new Olympic management for the United States.

Other Matters

During 1972 the Council developed criteria for athletic consortiums, and three such arrangements were approved—Vanderbilt University—Peabody College, Claremont—Harvey Mudd Colleges and Pomona—Pitzer Colleges.

In order to process eligibility appeals more quickly, the Council appointed a Subcommittee on Appeals to act in its stead. Each institution has the prerogative to appeal decisions of the Subcommittee to the Council itself.

Additional proposals to regulate recruiting practices will be before you on Saturday as developed by the Special Committee on Recruiting and approved by the Council.

After hearing recommendations from the Long-Range Planning Committee and the Special Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics for Women, the Council recommended the Executive Regulations be amended to permit women to compete in NCAA Championships. As you know from the Executive Committee report, this recommendation has been carried forward.

Major Legislative Considerations

The area to which we have given the most time and attention during this year as well as last year concerns the major legislative proposals which are before this Convention. They concern the restructuring of this Association and those several matters which have been broadly grouped under the term of financial aid proposals.

The NCAA has been of service to its member colleges since 1906; and for the past 20 years, has been called upon more and more to perform as a legislative, administrative agency in the membership's continuing effort to maintain intercollegiate athletics within reasonable educational concepts and boundaries.

As the NCAA membership has increased and athletic recruiting and scheduling become more national in character, national limitations have become more necessary. Further, during the past two years, the executive authorities of NCAA member colleges have argued increasingly for programs within the NCAA to deal with the spiraling costs of intercollegiate athletics.

To meet this need, the NCAA Council believes that on some issues it is essential that homogeneous groupings within the overall NCAA membership be able to come together for action. This is particularly true in matters of financial aid restrictions. Thus, through a series of amendments in the enclosed Official Notice, the Council recommends acceptance of a reorganization plan that maintains a common association tied together on most issues, but does provide for Bylaw divisional voting on certain legislation, including competition in NCAA events.

Thus, the reorganization plan will be the first major legislative action of the Sixty-Seventh Convention followed by the several financial aid proposals which have been presented to you in reports during the past two years. The Sixty-Seventh Convention provides an opportunity to make the Association more responsive to the

wishes of the membership—by providing a more flexible legislative forum for the diverse interests of higher education and by offering effective and needed legislative proposals in matters of financial aid and recruiting.

Some opposition to these proposals has been based on the alleged bias of our Council—that it is not truly representative of the Association membership. This contention, by itself, is rebuttable; but that is not my purpose today. These proposals should be considered upon their merits, and we firmly believe that legislative restructuring of the Association has been postponed too long—we are convinced that it is necessary to accomplish the legislative reorganization now, in the best interests of intercollegiate athletic administration and in the best interests of this Association.

No one plan is going to satisfy all segments of the membership. A basic reorganization plan should be adopted here, so we can deal effectively with other important issues, and the restructuring can be adjusted as necessary at subsequent meetings. The NCAA special committee dealing with reorganization discussed a different representation plan for our rules committees and the Council. It was agreed to defer for one year these proposals because of the great amount of legislation which has been offered to the 1973 Convention.

Mr. Chairman, this completes my report and I move its acceptance and approval, including the minutes in the Annual Reports.

[The motion was seconded, put to a vote and carried.]

7. REPORTS OF OTHER COMMITTEES

President Ramer: I call your attention at this point to the Reports of Other Committees. I have felt for several years, as I am sure some of you must have felt, that in that designation, "Other Reports," we have somehow closed in lack of identity the reports of many important working groups in this Association.

Academic Testing and Requirement Committee has faced since the very beginning of this organization important and controversial tasks which have been placed before you and me from time to time, controversial not merely in the athletic related may but controversial on the basis of educational commitments.

All-Star High School Games Committee.

College Committee.

Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports.

Extra Events.

Insurance.

Joint Legislative Committee for Athletics and Education.

Long Range Planning Committee is a committee authorized by this Association concerned with the development of proposed policy and procedures, policy and procedures indeed affecting many phases of our operation.

National Summer Youth Sports Program is certainly one of our more distinguished efforts, bringing the opportunity for athletic participation to young people all over the nation.

Postgraduate Scholarship Program.

Promotion.

Public Relations.

Statistics and Classification.

Summer Baseball.

All of these reports have significant material for the work of the Association.

Do I hear a motion that these reports be received by the Association?

[The motion was regularly made, seconded and carried.]

8. REPORT OF THE TELEVISION COMMITTEE

Seaver Peters (Dartmouth College): Thank you very much, Mr. President. I report to you on behalf of the 1972 NCAA TV Committee in place of Mr. Jim Decker, who because of ill health has been forced to resign his chairmanship which he held for the past two years and indeed take a leave of absence from his responsibilities at Syracuse University. All of us wish him a quick return to those duties.

You have been urging a review of reports. May I do the same? The report of the Television Committee is at the registration desk; and we welcome, first of all of course, your reading of it, but most importantly your comments, questions and suggestions as we look ahead.

May I remind you also of the multiple responsibilities of the TV Committee, first to bring representative games to the TV viewers, also to spread TV participation among as many colleges as possible but at the same time attracting in-stadium attendance.

I am not going into detail on this report, but rather outline to you a few highlights.

First, as has been referred to by earlier speakers, the plan was adopted in October 1971 by the membership by a vote of 191 to 16 which brought a record price of close to \$13½ million. May I remind you that the plan pertains to not only the 1972 season but also the season ahead of us, that of 1973.

The plan featured greater flexibility to the carrying network, in that they were allowed to select games on a weekly basis after the first six weeks of the season. This brought us different teams on TV and also more appealing games than would have been possible had the network been locked into games selected some six months before the season began.

The NCAA assessment percentage increased by one and one-half per cent primarily for construction of the new building, for promotion and for the financing of the postgraduate scholarship program.

I think the best endorsement of college football in the TV package is the fact that ABC, the carrying network, was able to sell all available commercial space during the 1972 season. Of course, in addition, for the 19th consecutive year football attendance increased. Nine of the 11 major colleges showed an increase in attendance at football games.

As we look ahead to this year, first and foremost on the agenda of the TV Committee is the rewriting of the plan to bring to you for a vote no later than September 1. When approved, it will go out with a new plan for the seasons 1974 and 1975. It is vital that we do this and follow this date of September 1 because all of the TV football packages—ABC, CBS and NBC—expire in their contracts with the professionals and of course ABC's plan with the NCAA. We must be ready by September 1 to come to you with a new plan and hopefully for your approval.

We also must watch carefully the CATV cable and television industry. The impact of cable television can be most dangerous to the national sports package.

Night telecasts for the past two years have had a relatively low rating. You will want to take a good look at this.

In addition, the regional and district coverage demands our attention. As you know, on six Saturdays in the year the TV program must consist of three to five community games to separate and reasonably sized regions, some of the regions to be, of course, the national coverage. It is of concern that on many of the six Saturdays, one of the contests has been more a national contest while the other two to four contests have been very, very limited and perhaps not a reasonably sized region.

I also ask you to examine the table in the Annual Report, which shows the number of participating institutions, the total number of participating institutions on the program by districts. We are concerned here about the balance. It might not be just what an ideal national package might be.

The Committee also wishes to remind the membership of the ability of our organization to sell a series of football telecasts as an enormous benefit to the entire membership. The NCAA assessment during that period from 1951 to date has been better than \$4 million. While initially those monies went to assist the TV Committee in conducting the required meetings plus building and restructuring the plan—today a very lucrative plan—the assessment has funded, as I suggested, the postgraduate scholarship program. The revenue has provided most of the money granted to the National Collegiate Sports Services to enable them to conduct their statistical program. And of course it has been of assistance to the Association in constructing the new headquarters building.

The previous speakers have referred to the College Division bowl contests, the \$240,000, and of course the requirement in the plan that the carrying network televise four NCAA championship events for a like fee of \$80,000.

We think all of these points fail in significance in relation to the most important of all aspects of the NCAA television plan—control by television of college football. You take away the NCAA controls; and nearly every football-playing member would face competition from the telecasts of local major conference, any nearby major or independent or any nationally packaged program, whether organized by the NCAA or not. Thus, while the NCAA program does indeed benefit the best football program, it has many benefits as well for the institution which does not expect its game to be shown on the coast-to-coast basis.

One more reminder from the TV Committee: the selection of games to be shown is the sole responsibility of the carrying network.

After you have read the report, we will welcome your suggestions, criticisms and comments.

Mr. President, I move the acceptance of the report of the 1972 NCAA Television Committee.

[The motion was seconded, put to a vote and carried.]

9. REPORT OF THE JOINT LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE

Robert C. James (Atlantic Coast Conference): Mr. President, the

Joint Legislative Committee is certainly not one of the best known in the Association, yet I believe it has been one of the most active in the past year. Increasingly, administration of athletic programs leads to the legislature and to the courts. The role of the NCAA Joint Committee representative is to work with colleagues of high schools and junior college associations to advance the interest of their constituencies and to forward information on legislative matters to the National Policy Board of the Joint Committee, a nine-man group of three representatives from each of the educational groups. Conversely, each man is asked to assist in contacting members of the Federal Congress in his state when athletically related matters are before their body or committee.

Of particular importance to those present today, the members of the Joint Committee occasionally are asked to contact their counterparts at the other institutions in their state and request that they in turn communicate with the key legislator. Accordingly, when you are contacted by the Joint Committee and asked to help because the key legislator is in your district or attended your institution, I sincerely hope you will respond, even though the request may come at a particularly busy time. The alternative might be the passage of a bill which would jeopardize a particular college program or might even intrude upon the control of our own program.

Let me mention several items on which you might be asked to assist the Joint Committee in the near future. As you know, the 93rd Congress has just convened, and we anticipate many of the sports bills introduced in the last Congress will be brought up again. The total at the last session was astoundingly some 80 bills which affected the school-college sports program. Many of the basic issues remain unresolved and of interest to several Congressmen in each case. One issue which most certainly will be introduced, which I strongly urge you to oppose without prompting from the Joint Committee, is the National Amateur Sports Foundation Bill introduced in the last Congress by Senators Gravel and Thurmond. Essentially this bill would provide federal funding for existing bodies governing amateur sports and is a thinly veiled attempt to provide financial transfusion for those organizations which attempt to maintain their control of amateur sports in the United States Olympic Committee.

The National Policy Board, supporting the growing demand for the reorganization of the USOC, has opposed making any federal funds available, and certainly no consideration of such a plan should be undertaken until some of the critical amateur sports issues are resolved. Furthermore, the bill establishes a federal body with apparent power to control many aspects of sports. Most college administrators I know oppose any government intervention in such matters.

It is hard to tell from this bill just how extensive the foundation's powers might become, but the Committee believes the trends in federal traditions would be to considerable power. It thinks it is highly preferable not to start down this path. Besides, we oppose the use of federal funds to support organizations which do not have economic viability in their own right primarily due to lack of true programs and meaningful activity.

The second topic to be considered is the merger of the profes-

sional basketball leagues. Philosophically, the Joint Committee and the NCAA oppose any merger in any sports organization and prefer to let all parties compete in the marketplace under full anti-trust impact. However, it was apparent during the last session that the basketball leagues had too many promises of support from key members of the Judiciary Committee drafting legislation for that support to be realized.

The National Policy Board worked successfully, however, to have a bill reported which would (1) protect school-college games from television intrusion on days of greatest scheduling density; (2) protect to some degree—less than we desired—the rights of graduating players who wished to pursue professional careers; (3) prevent the merged league from procuring a monopolistic stranglehold on the community in which the franchise operates often to the detriment of the school athletic program, and (4) provide some protection to college programs from the raids of professionals seeking to sign undergraduate players while still protecting the rights of the players.

The bill which was reported in the Senate, was not considered by either House, but it did contain most of these protections, so many in fact that there was speculation that the leagues would not merge under its conditions, if it were passed.

Another proposal would grant the Secretary of Labor power to establish sports safety and health standards and could establish student-athletes as employees in reference to Workmen's Compensation Laws. You delegates have provided considerable information on the existing phases in your medical program to show such an act is not necessary.

It has been suggested that a number of states legalize gambling on team sports as a fund-raising activity. The danger to college sports is obvious. I urge you to let your friends of the colleges and universities know of the opposition of the schools and colleges and remind them of the scars left by gamblers previously.

The area of television always demands diligent attention, and here the Committee received assistance from the Television Committee. Current problems involve CATV, lack of copyright protection for sports programming, prime-time access rule and a possible severe rate increase in occasional-use transmission rates which would threaten such college television programs as conference basketball packages, football television exemption telecasts and single-game telecasts by individual institutions in any sport.

These are just a few of the items confronting the Committee, but I hope they illustrate the necessity of schools and colleges being well represented in Washington and in each state capital.

Finally, I ask your cooperation in another way. When the Joint Committee represents your interest, it must have good data from which to work. Members of Congress want facts, not opinions. When the Joint Committee or the staff calls upon you for information about television or about attendance trends or raiding activities by pro sports, please respond as quickly and thoroughly as possible. It certainly will help us to do a better job for you.

[Motion was regularly made to accept the report, seconded and carried.]

10. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Transfer of Membership

President Ramer: We begin with a request from Memphis State University to withdraw Proposal No. 1. Whether you consider that a happy note in the beginning or an unhappy note depends upon the position from which you are viewing this whole matter.

With your permission then we move to Item No. 2, a proposal concerning Committee Chairmen, and the Chair recognizes at this time Mr. Koenig of Valparaiso University who will present this for the Council.

Committee Chairmen

Richard P. Koenig (Valparaiso University): Mr. President, on behalf of the Council, I will ask you to limit the terms of the committee chairmen to the same length as those of committee members; effective immediately.

I move we amend Article 7, Sections 1-(a)-(5), 2-(a)-(5), 3-(a)-(8) and 4-(a)-(6), as printed on page A-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

As the intent indicates, we want to limit the terms of committee chairmen to the same length as those of the committee members in all of the Association committees.

[Proposal No. 2 (page A-1) was approved by voice vote.]

Competitive Safeguards Committee

President Ramer: Item No. 3, concerning the Committee on Competitive Safeguards. The presentation of this by Mr. Carl Blyth of the University of North Carolina.

Carl Blyth (University of North Carolina): Mr. Chairman, I would like to move the adoption of Article 7, Section 1-(c), Competitive Safeguards Committee, as written, as follows:

The Committee shall disseminate such information as might appropriately be brought to the attention of the Association's membership and adopt recommended policies and standards designed to further the above objectives.

[The motion was seconded.]

I think there has been enough comment from previous presentations of government intervention, and we think we would like to be in a position to set policies and standards before they are set for us.

J. Neils Thompson (University of Texas): Mr. Chairman, I am sure I am reading more into this than what I think is intended, but it says "membership and adopt recommended policies and standards designed to further the above objectives." I am concerned about the fact that even though we all favor improvement in the safeguards and moving in this particular direction to provide for safety of our athletes, maybe we might require a knee brace on the right knee; and it would go into effect immediately. Is there any control or limitation?

We have another example. We now have three days of preparation. What if this committee adopts prior to football that we have seven days? I do not think all of this is intended, but it looks like it gives this committee a great deal of authority.

President Ramer: Thank you, Neils. I would like to ask Dr. Blyth or a member of his committee to respond.

Mr. Blyth: We did recommend the three days of practice that was adopted, but we cannot do any more than bring it to you for your acceptance. I kind of felt originally that was what it meant, but it doesn't mean that at all. We don't want them to get involved and say these are the things that are necessary. Right now the President signed a bill on November 12 or 15, somewhere there, and they are already becoming involved in showing us some of the things they think we ought to be doing. We think you ought to accept these things, not us.

Mr. Thompson: That information is very satisfactory. I am hopeful that explanation will guide those who make interpretations of this action subsequently.

[Proposal No. 3 (page A-1) was approved by voice vote.]

Committees

President Ramer: The proposal concerning Committee Organization will be presented for the Council by Dr. Samuel Barnes, our Secretary-Treasurer.

Samuel E. Barnes (District of Columbia Teachers College): President Ramer, I propose the recommendation that we amend Article 7, Section 2, by adding some new paragraphs as shown in the bold type, and that we reletter all subsequent paragraphs.

I move this be accepted, sir.

[The motion was seconded.]

As it is printed, President Ramer, it says it is just a matter of formalizing our existing procedures; and this in no way detracts from what has already been accepted by the convention.

[Proposal No. 4 (page A-2) was approved by voice vote.]

Committees

President Ramer: Dr. Barnes will also present Proposal No. 5, concerned with Committee Organization.

Mr. Barnes: President Ramer, I move that we amend Bylaws Article 7, Section 2, by adding paragraphs (x) and (y).

President Ramer: Thank you—again proposing to formalize existing procedures.

[Proposal No. 5 (page A-2) was seconded and approved by voice vote.]

Drug Education Committee

President Ramer: Reference has been made already to the important activity of our Drug Education Committee. We have a proposal to formalize the existence of that committee as one of our regular standing committees of the Association. I call upon its chairman, Robert Pritchard, Worcester Polytechnic Institute, to present this amendment.

Robert W. Pritchard (Worcester Polytechnic Institute): Mr. President, on behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of a new Article 7, Section 2.

[The motion was seconded.]

The committee has been operating as an ad hoc committee. This

would make it a standing committee of the organization, to be effective immediately.

[Proposal No. 6 (page A-2) was approved by voice vote.]

Track and Field Committee

President Ramer: A proposal relating to the Track and Field Committee will be presented by Mr. Walter Hass, University of Chicago.

Walter L. Hass (University of Chicago): Mr. President, I move that we amend Article 7, Section 3-(d), as pertaining to the Track and Field Committee.

[The motion was seconded.]

As you may notice, this is to accommodate the National High School Federation who wish to have their own rules as far as track and field is concerned; and then after one year, reduce the committee to 12 to conform with the normal committee membership in the Council based on the multiple of three.

[Proposal No. 7 (page A-3) was approved by voice vote.]

Soccer Committee

President Ramer: Proposal concerning the Soccer Committee, to be presented by Marshall Turner, Johns Hopkins University.

Marshall S. Turner Jr. (Johns Hopkins University): Mr. President and fellow delegates, I move that we amend Article 7, Section 3-(e) to increase the membership of the Soccer Rules Tournament Committee from six members to nine members.

[The motion was seconded.]

As most of you are probably aware, the NCAA has established a College Division National Championship in soccer to be run by the same Rules Tournament Committee. This work load is pretty heavy; and in order to do it properly, it was felt the membership of that committee should be increased to nine.

[Proposal No. 8 (page A-3) was approved by voice vote.]

Swimming Committee

President Ramer: Will Mr. Walter Hass approach the dais again? Mr. Hass will present for the Council the Proposal No. 9, relating to the Swimming Committee.

Walter L. Hass (University of Chicago): Mr. President, I move that we amend Bylaw Article 7, Section 3-(f) as pertaining to the Swimming Committee.

[The motion was seconded.]

Like the Track and Field Committee, it is to accommodate the High School Federation and also to reduce the committee members to 12 after one year.

Walter D. Bryant (University of South): I thought a few years back we passed some legislation to assure that there would be a diving-expertise man on this committee. This seems to eliminate that. I question why.

Mr. Hass: The only response I can give to Walter is that it is limited to 12, and we feel the swimming people who are recommending men to this committee will see that all aspects of swimming are covered on the committee.

President Ramer: I think Mr. Bryant has raised an important question. I wonder if we have any personnel here from the Council or

otherwise who may have additional information in response to Walter's question.

Richard P. Koenig (Valparaiso University): Mr. Chairman, I am not sure I can answer your question completely and accurately, Walter. It is my recollection that we did not pass a specific motion here to do what you indicated. It was discussed and provisions were made so that the Committee on Committees would be given the information so that balanced representation could be made on the Swimming Committee. A precedent in the matter, whereby you were to say diving here and something else there, it was felt at the time by a committee appointed to study committee representatives would be an item to study. You could get yourself into a situation, for example, in Track and Field, where you would have any number of events and each event should be represented—admittedly an extreme illustration but it could happen.

Mr. Bryant: It is an extreme situation, Dick. My swimming coach sent me up here because he is a diving coach. This seems unfair to me. Personally, I cannot understand why we would eliminate the assurance of having someone with diving expertise at the NCAA Swimming and Diving Championships.

David B. Eavenson (Dickinson College): As a member of the Swimming Rules Committee, I strongly urge that this amendment be defeated. Although we have swimming coaches on that committee, very few if any have expertise in diving; and diving is becoming more complicated each year. I believe we should continue to have a diving expert as a member of the Swimming Rules Committee.

J. Lloyd Milam (University of Southern Mississippi): I can assure you, if you want diving included in the organization where swimming and diving apply, you had better designate diving to be represented on the committee, that is doing the policy making.

Mr. Koenig: Mr. Chairman, I think it is important to recognize that this does not preclude diving on the committee.

[Proposal No. 9 (page A-3) was defeated by voice vote but later approved as amended (see No. 109, page A-62).]

Wrestling Committee

President Ramer: We move to the proposal concerning the Wrestling Committee. Walter Hass will wrestle with this one.

Walter Hass (University of Chicago): Mr. President, I am almost afraid to get up here. My wrestling coach wants to be sure there is an expert on heavy-weight coaching because that is the only one we have.

I move we amend Article 7, Section 3-(g), as pertains to the Wrestling Committee

[Proposal No. 10 (page A-4) was seconded and approved by voice vote.]

Baseball Committee

President Ramer: Now a proposal concerning the Baseball Committee. Lou Myers of the University of Arizona.

Louis Myers (University of Arizona): Mr. President, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 11, which amends Bylaws Article 7, Section 3-(m).

[Proposal No. 11 (page A-4) was seconded and approved by voice vote.]

Volleyball Committee

President Ramer: Proposal concerning the Volleyball Committee will be presented by Wayne Duke, Big Ten Commissioner.

Wayne Duke (Big Ten Conference): On behalf of the NCAA Executive Committee, I move the self-explanatory amendment to Article 7, Section 4-(i).

[Proposal No. 12 (page A-5) was seconded and approved by voice vote.]

Amendments

President Ramer: We proceed to Proposal No. 13, to be presented by Ralph Fadum of North Carolina State University.

Ralph E. Fadum (North Carolina State University): Mr. President, on behalf of the Council, I wish to move the adoption of an amendment to Article 7 of the Constitution, as set forth in Proposal 13.

[The motion was seconded.]

The purpose of the amendment is to provide for the adoption of legislation relating to the Constitution at any special Convention of the Association when and if such a special convention shall be held.

President Ramer: As you recognize, this would be a constitutional change requiring a two-thirds vote. Without any attempt whatever to influence your vote, I am going to call for a voice vote first. If it happens to be unanimous we will not need to take a paddle vote. I am going to ask that those of you who favor this proposal let it be known by saying "aye;" opposed, "no."

The Chair calls for a show of paddles on this, and we will have an experience for the first time in NCAA history. We have members of our Voting Committee, under the chairmanship of Mr. Frericks, taking respective positions for counting. We are asking now that those favoring this motion let it be known by a show of paddles. I am asking that the Voting Committee present their totals to Dr. Barnes, our Secretary-Treasurer, and we will total after the sub-totals have been made. I will call for a negative vote. Those voting in opposition to the motion please let it be known by a raising of paddles.

[Proposal No. 13 (page A-5) was approved 307-22.]

Amendments

President Ramer: No. 14, to be presented by Dr. Ralph Fadum of North Carolina State University.

Ralph E. Fadum (North Carolina State University): On behalf of the Council, I wish to move the adoption of an amendment to the Bylaws, as set forth in Proposal No. 14; and I should add that the nature of this proposal is much the same as the one that you have just acted upon, except this relates to the Bylaws whereas the former related to the Constitution.

[Proposal No. 14 (page A-6) was seconded and approved by voice vote.]

Reconsideration of Proposal No. 9

Karl Kurth, Jr. (Trinity College): Mr. Chairman, I would like to raise a point of order. It seems to me that the main objection to Proposal No. 9, concerning swimming, was with respect to the elimination of the requirement that a man with expertise in diving be on

the Committee. I feel we lost the whole motion because of that, and I wonder if it might be reconsidered.

President Ramer: Are you moving for reconsideration of No. 9, sir?

Mr. Kurth: I would like to recommit No. 9 and eliminate the elimination of the part "and the fourth shall have expertise in diving." If that is in order, sir, I would like to move that.

President Ramer: All right. The motion is for reconsidering. Is there a second to that motion?

Walter D. Bryant (University of the South): I started the whole thing, and I would like to second it because I am in sympathy.

President Ramer: All right. The motion is debatable. Is there discussion on the motion to reconsider? There being no discussion, I will call for the vote on the motion to reconsider.

[Motion approved by voice vote.]

I assume from Mr. Kurth, that Bylaw amendment No. 9 is now before the house with the motion to amend by restoring the phrase concerned with expertise in diving.

[The motion was seconded.]

All right. The motion has been seconded. We are now discussing the amendment.

Seaver Peters (Dartmouth College): Mr. President, would that make it a 14-member committee? If it is appropriate I would wonder aloud about another amendment. To the phrase (1), "One member from each of the eight geographic districts," I would propose to add: "one of whom is an expert in diving." Would that retain the 13-man committee? I don't know whether that is in order at this time.

President Ramer: I think this would achieve the purpose you have in mind. From your point of view, may we recognize the amendment in this fashion, as proposed by Seaver Peters, that we would mandate the addition of expertise in diving in paragraph (f)? We would then not be in any difficulty in the number on the committee.

Mr. Kurth: Mandate the position. That was the intent of my proposal.

President Ramer: Excellent. Then the Chair recognizes the proposed amendment to mandate expertise in diving as a part of paragraph (f). Does the second agree to this?

Mr. Bryant: Yes.

President Ramer: I assume the amendment now as proposed and seconded.

[The motion was approved by voice vote.]

We are facing the main motion as amended now, No. 9, as amended, to include a representative having expertise in diving. Is there further discussion of the main motion?

[The motion was approved by voice vote.]

11. REPORT OF THE MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE

President Ramer: Members of the Convention, I call for your attention to the Report of the Memorial Resolutions Committee; and I will ask Edwin P. Horner, Chairman of the Committee on Memorial Resolutions, to come to the dais to present that report at this time.

Edwin P. Horner (Baylor University): Mr. President and delegates to this Convention: We pause at this time to honor the memory of our friends who passed away during the year 1972. The Memorial Resolutions Committee expresses to the families of our departed friends

our deepest sympathy and recalls with appreciation our friendship with them during our work in the development of youth through intercollegiate athletics. We ask the members of this Convention to join with us in these sentiments and following the reading of the names of our departed colleagues, to stand in a moment of silent prayer in their memory.

Gurney F. Affterbach, Muehlenberg College
 Paul E. Arnold, Plymouth State College
 Dwight V. "Dike" Beede, Youngstown State University
 Larry Beck, University of Louisville
 Arthur J. Bergman, Catholic University
 Emil W. Breittkrentz, University of Southern California
 Tom Bryon, Westmont College
 George Busenburg, Ohio State University
 George Clark, University of Nebraska
 Gerald P. Doherty, University of Delaware
 Eugene Duffy, NCAA
 John B. Edger, Wesleyan College
 George Edwards, University of Missouri
 Harry Fogleman, Davidson College
 Donald Frail, Marietta (Ohio) College
 Chester Gargas, Northwestern University
 Mathew Geis, Princeton University
 Ralph Ginn, South Dakota State University
 Ralph Guarasci, Ohio State University
 Rev. Henry C. Honsberger, C.M., St. John's University
 Conrad Jennings, Marquette University
 Bernard P. Kelly, Harvard University
 James Kelly, University of Minnesota, Twin Cities
 J. Forrest Kelley, Wiley College
 Earl Keth, Central Missouri State University
 Harry Kipke, University of Michigan
 Fritz Knorr, Kansas State University
 Lawrence T. Lowery, Salem State College
 John MacFayden, Bowdoin College
 Jesse W. Mason, Georgia Tech
 John F. Meehan, Manhattan College
 Robert M. Milten, Westchester State College
 Joseph Murphy, Manhattan College
 Frank L. Myers, Kansas State University
 R. N. McCray, William & Mary
 Edwin McDonald, Loyola—Los Angeles
 Herbert McQuillan, Texas A & M, Stetson
 Julian H. Pittard, Georgia Tech
 Harry Rabenhorst, Louisiana State University
 Robert Rainey, Albany (Ga.) State College
 Dr. E. F. Rath, Stanford University
 Francis X. Reagan, Villanova University
 George B. Simler, U.S. Air Force Academy
 Orland Sims, Rice University
 Victor Garland Sorrell, North Carolina State
 Wilbur Stalcup, University of Missouri
 Robert Stewart, St. Louis University

John Stoeber, Thiel College
 Maurice Suher, American International
 Dean Trevor, Knox College
 Forrest Twogood, University of Southern California
 Donald B. Walker, Upsala College
 Ed Walker, University of Mississippi
 Paul H. Way, Allegheny College
 Glen Whitis, Hardin-Simmons University
 Frank Wickhorst, University of California, Berkeley

Shall we stand?

[The members rose and stood for one minute in silent prayer for their departed colleagues.]

Mr. President, this is the report of your Memorial Resolutions Committee, and we ask that it be received and that the families be notified of our expression of sympathy and of our pleasant memories of our departed friends.

President Ramer: The session has not been recessed. The Chair rules that the order of our standing in tribute to our departed colleagues constitutes our affirmative vote in receiving this report of the Committee.

I would like to ask that Mr. Horner, Chairman of the Committee, remain here on the dais briefly toward the end of this meeting, and those of you who have names that may not have been included in the report please present the names to Mr. Horner during the next few minutes.

Gentlemen, we stand recessed in business session until 3 o'clock tomorrow afternoon, but we will all be back together again here for the round table this afternoon.

[The Business Session then recessed at 11:25 p.m.]

COMBINED UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGE DIVISION ROUND TABLE

Thursday Afternoon, January 11, 1973

The Round Table convened in the Red Lacquer Room at 2:10 p.m., Samuel E. Barnes, NCAA Secretary-Treasurer, presiding.

Chairman Barnes: Gentlemen, we are very happy to see each of you this afternoon.

We face two subjects. One is the discussion of Proposals on Reorganization. The second is Proposals Related to Numbers, Need and Candidate's Declaration Procedure. First, we are going to direct our attention to the proposal on reorganization and try to answer whatever questions you have pertaining to that particular subject. If time permits, then we would propose to go to the second, which discusses the need, numbers and candidate's form.

This afternoon we are concerned with edification, clarification, and any questions you might have pertaining to reorganization. I assure you there will be no attempt on the part of any speaker to give the impression that he is for any persons, organizations or group of persons in this issue. The speakers intend to give you what in their judgments are the pros and cons of reorganization. There will be no attempt to tell you how your conscience should be relative to our subject.

To everything there is a season and a time to every purpose under the Heaven; a time to be born and a time to die; a time to plant and a time to pluck up that which is planted; a time to kill and a time to heal; a time to break down, a time to build up; a time to weep and a time to laugh; a time to mourn and a time to dance; a time to cast away stones and a time to gather stones together; a time to embrace and a time to refrain from embracing; a time to gain and a time to lose; a time to keep and a time to cast away; a time to render and a time to sow; a time to keep silence and a time to speak; a time to love and a time to hate; a time of war and a time of peace.

At this time we are going to talk on the Proposals Relative to Reorganization. [Laughter]

At this time I would like to introduce David Swank, from the University of Oklahoma, whose subject is "Evolution of NCAA divisions and the current need for reorganization." I will not introduce each of the others; but as each one has completed his discourse, the other will follow immediately. After that, we will go into the question and answer period.

David Swank (University of Oklahoma): I am afraid Sam made one statement that is a little bit misleading. He talked about the dissertations and discourses we are going to give. What we have, I am sure, will not rise to the level of any kind of dissertation. What we are going to try to do is give you some facts so that we can answer some questions later on.

I have the first presentation on the evolution and history of reorganization. I am going to try to be very brief. Some of you are aware of

how this movement toward reorganization began, which goes back some 20 or 30 years.

In December of 1937, the NCAA first established the NCAA College Committee. At that time this Committee was created to bring to the attention of the Association matters relating to the smaller colleges and universities in the Association.

It rocked along then without much change. I wasn't here at that time so I don't know exactly what went on, but there was no significant change until January of 1954. At that time we created the office of Vice-President-at-Large. This individual's responsibility on the NCAA Council was to represent the interests and viewpoints of the College Division institutions.

Then we began to create the College Division championships. The first of these was the College Division Basketball Tournament, which split off from the University Division in 1957. Shortly thereafter, in November of 1958, we followed with the creation of the College Division cross-country championships. Then in the next nine years, from 1958 to 1967, five more of these College Division championships were created.

Now, at this time there was self-determination by the members of the Association as to whether they would participate in College Division or University Division championships. There was some concern by the various members of the Association. Many felt that this was bad, so in January of 1967 we adopted a Bylaw which has since become known to some as the "fish or fowl" rule. That Bylaw required the member institution to compete solely in the College Division or solely in the University Division. There could be no switching back and forth between divisions. This bylaw was to become effective in September of 1968.

In the January 1968 convention there was considerable concern raised by the member institutions that were going to be forced to make this election, and they asked that we amend this "fish or fowl" Bylaw, but it was defeated.

When this went into effect, in September of 1968, there were 133 completely University Division members, 355 completely College Division members. There were 114 members that were in that limbo group that were going to either championship depending upon the level of their athletic program. They were required to make that election in September of 1968, and 89 at that time—I don't know whether you want to say were forced—but anyway, they were required to select the University Division. The other portion of these, some 25 members, went into the College Division.

Since that time there has been more and more concern with the requirement to be in one or the other division. Many of the 114 who were required to elect did not wish to do so. They would have liked to continue to participate on the split level.

We would point out to you there is another part of our Association in which there is no self-determination. Right now we have 243 University Division members. In the sports of football and basketball they are classified either Major or College Division by the Statistics and Classification Committee. They have no say-so as to how they are going to be classified. It depends upon their schedule, it depends upon their program. At the present time there are 121 of these 243 that are classified Major in football. So we don't really have the completely

self-determined group, as some people seem to be saying at this time.

Now this "fish or fowl" rule is one of the major participating factors that caused the continued movement toward reorganization. In addition, the 1,600 rule has caused a great deal of animosity between the two divisions. When this 1,600 rule first went into effect many of the University people felt this would be forced upon them by the College people, which was not accurate. It is interesting to note that today there is a substantial change, and now many of the University people feel that the College Division might be trying to take this particular rule out. This was another factor that gave rise to the movement toward reorganization and the divisiveness that seems to be growing within the Association.

Then the freshman rule was considered last year and several years ago. Concurrent with it were the financial aid study, the limitation on the number of scholarships and the need formula, that we have been working with now for some three years.

You may recall the genesis of this was a financial aid study to be made about four or five years ago. That study showed many colleges and universities were having financial difficulties. The Council felt a need to do something about it. We created a committee which became known as the Flynn Committee, and that committee studied and came up with recommendations on need and numbers. But again there was a divisiveness between the College Division and the University Division in trying to work out these problems.

In order to try to stop some of this distrust and to try to counter a suggestion made by some of our major football coaches that the organization split up, the Long Range Planning Committee in the summer of 1967 recommended to the Council that we create a committee to study reorganization. That committee was appointed in August of 1971, and I was appointed chairman. We were asked to report in October with a possible plan for reorganization.

Well, in two months that was almost an impossibility. We did meet and discuss it; and what we came up with was that we should ask the members: Do you want reorganization? If you will recall, in the fall of 1971 we sent to each faculty representative and each athletic director a questionnaire concerning reorganization. That questionnaire did not purport to establish a plan; it merely pointed out some possibilities and asked: Are you interested in reorganization and along what basic lines?

We reported to you on that study last year at the Convention. At that time, approximately 75 to 80 per cent of the members said, "We do need some type of reorganization."

You will recall there was a request for a special convention, which did not pass. After the Convention the Council again directed the committee to go back to the drawing board and try to create a plan for reorganization. The committee did that, and reported it to the Council.

This committee consisted of seven people. There was Stan Marshall, chairman of the College Committee; Ed Sherman, who was supposed to be one of the speakers today, from Muskingum College; Dick Bowers, another College Division representative from South Florida; Claude Gilstrap, University of Texas, Arlington; Ed Czekaj, Penn State; Bob James, commissioner of the Atlantic Coast Conference, and myself as chairman.

We considered this plan and presented it to the Council. At that time it was urged there be three divisions. This group, we thought, represented all the diverse interests in the Association.

We took this plan to the Council, and the Council didn't buy it. They thought we should not have the three divisions we proposed, but felt we should have two divisions. This is what we have in our present plan today.

Now at that time we also recommended other things. We recommended the reorganization of the Council. We recommended some change in the officers' structure. These recommendations were not adopted by the Council, not because they were bad recommendations, but because the Council looked at all the legislation which was going to be presented to this body at this meeting—reorganization, means, limitation, 1,600—and they said, "We cannot present that much. There is no way for all of that to be validly and intelligently considered." If reorganization is adopted, then the committee or a committee will be sent back to study further and to bring back other recommendations on how we can reorganize the Council. Should we redistrict the Association into new districts? Should we change the officer structure in any way?

These are not ideas that are dead and buried. These are ideas that the Council considered which will be looked into next year if the reorganization is adopted. I suppose even if it is not adopted, decisions will be made on those; and they will be brought to you next year for consideration.

What we have done is to take a first step in the reorganization plan which is presented to you. It is not intended to be the ultimate, final reorganization of this Association.

Now I am getting into one other subject because it doesn't seem to fit with anyone else's topic. I think what I have tried to do here is give a history of reorganization and why we need it. I will briefly summarize that.

I think we need reorganization because of the many divisive interests that have grown up within this group, so we can have both groups speaking their pieces. Ed Czekaj, last year, when we talked about this, said "It looks like you are going to a type of federal systems." What it does is bring the Association into two powers, each with some voice of veto over the other. If this reorganization plan were adopted at this meeting, the Bylaws would be voted upon under the reorganization plan. At your meeting Saturday, when you are voting, you would be under the reorganization. You would be voting by divisions, if it is passed as it is presented.

I will now turn it over to Richard Koenig, who is going to discuss with you why we have the two rather than a three or four-division plan.

Richard P. Koenig (Valparaiso University): Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: So you can identify the perspective from which I speak, you will notice David did not mention my name when he was talking about the committee. I was not on the Reorganization Committee. I am, as was pointed out this morning, the Vice-President-at-Large and a member of the NCAA Eligibility Committee and Appeals Committee; and I had the privilege of working with some of the interpretations of the regulations which you have established in the past.

My objective here is to try to clarify the proposal for reorganization

as it relates to the number of divisions. Please try, as I discuss this important point, to keep in mind the distinction I will really be making between division for legislation and division for competition. Therein, as I see it, lies the key to understanding my comments and hopefully, the key to answering some of the concerns I have heard voiced about the proposal.

Very simply, the proposal is this: Two legislative divisions, without intending to attach a different status to either; two competitive divisions for sports where we now have University and College Division tournaments, with the exception of adding a third competitive division for basketball and cross country, with national championships in all.

I make that distinction because right now we do not have national championships in the College Division. We have national College Division championships.

There are also provisions about which Ed Sherman will be talking, concerning moving up and so forth. I am not going to go into that, but will confine my time to the two or three divisions, keeping in mind all this is being proposed while we are keeping the NCAA in one convention with meetings of one body for legislative purposes; so we can have the necessary interchange between divisions thereby permitting us to continue to learn from each other.

It is important also to point out, when we are considering the number of divisions, if either legislative division decides further division of itself is desired for competitive purposes—in other words a divisional national championship is more important—the proposal provides for this without a veto of the other division.

A key question could be asked and has been asked in this connection: If we are going to have three competitive divisions and possibly more, why not a similar number of legislative divisions?

Very simply, the Council decided to try at one convention—and I emphasize “one convention”—establishing three or four legislative divisions would be a most difficult if not impossible task. As many of you know, some schools are not happy now when only one line is drawn between the two divisions. Some don't like the requirements for Division I; and some, for equally valid but completely different reasons, don't like the requirement for Division II. What would we have if two or three lines were attempted?

The solution thus seems to the Council to be to walk before we can run. Let's divide into two legislative divisions, and then let's each look at his own problems and decide on the basis of his own quota what further adjustments are needed in legislation as well as in competition.

Another way of possibly solving the situation might be to say that the two divisions for legislation will formalize the voting procedure. Both legislative divisions will be trying in a more compatible group to adopt legislation as restrictive or more restrictive, and the result will apply to each division.

As an aside, while talking reorganization and legislation and in an attempt to answer partially what one friend calls a paranoia, a fear that each division is out to control the other one, let me cite some statistics which to me were revealing.

It seems to me they are especially significant when we hear comments about lack of representation on the part of 441 CD's or control

or lack of control by 243 UD's.

The most voting delegates ever to register for any previous NCAA convention where legislation is passed—436. Keep in mind now, I am not saying the most in attendance; I am saying the most voting delegates. The most UD—220; the most CD—210. The most voting on any single piece of legislation—355.

This, gentlemen, refers to all the legislation in your book right now. I will leave it up to your judgment what these statistics mean, but I think they are revealing.

Also you notice I draw a distinction between less restrictive, as restrictive, and more restrictive. I think you should recognize that according to the proposal we have to wrestle with the problem of less restriction, in other words, more liberal. The proposal says this has to pass both divisions. We recognize there is some objection to this requirement.

But, I ask you, is it too unreasonable a demand? Shouldn't more liberal legislation than we now have on our books stand the test of a vote of both divisions, so that we are reasonably certain that the action will lead to the advancement of athletics in both divisions?

Before concluding, I wish to remind all of you it is very simple. The basic consideration, which I am sure is uppermost in the minds of all of us as we consider reorganization, is the overriding concern in all of our actions for the individual, the participant who derives the greatest benefit from our program. If we can keep the focus on the individual aspect in the midst of the many sometimes confusing proposals, we will see what many consider to be an overpowering need for reorganization; and we will be taking recognition of the extensive differences which now exist in all the emphases, staffs, facilities, budgets and the like. That will provide the opportunity for two legislative divisions under one unifying umbrella to enact rules affecting our student-athletes which will be more consistent with these differences. We will also be providing for two additional national championships and the comparably simple mechanics for the addition of some other competitive opportunities under more equitable circumstances for the student-athlete as each successive division desires for its own level.

In conclusion then, let me say once again the Council has decided on two legislative divisions under one legislative body to keep us united in one convention while at the same time allowing for a changing situation as Dave has described.

We have much in common. We have much which unites us. We also have differences. We recognize that the proposed reorganization is not the perfect answer for all, but the Council submits it to you as a first step which will enable us, on the basis of divisional voting, to consider subsequent proposals here today and at subsequent sessions of the Convention, and at subsequent conventions. An example would be the case of limitation of numbers and the like. We will consider them on the basis of merit as they affect each division.

C. R. Gilstrap will follow.

C. R. Gilstrap (University of Texas, Arlington): I have been given the title of “Comparison of the Present and Proposed Structures.” This involves statistics, which is always a highly interesting subject. I am going to tell you how it is now, and I am going to tell you how it will be if you pass reorganization.

We presently have two classifications determined by institutional

determination and the "fish or fowl" rule. According to the present manual, we have 243 University Division members and 422 College Division members.

There is something else that cuts across all of this—a statistical classification in the sports of basketball, football and baseball into Major or College Division which has nothing to do with the enrollment. Based on this there are 120 Major football-playing institutions, 216 Major basketball schools and a number of Major baseball schools.

Now then, for legislative purposes all members of this Association are eligible to vote on every question that comes up. I think the Association has long recognized the fallacy inherent in this method, with the result that the President of this Association at the beginning of each convention stands before you and explains a gimmick called "conscience voting" which doesn't work. As proof of the fact it doesn't work, a number of years ago there was some sort of ice hockey regulation and a group of us from Texas who were really not vitally involved did a little log-rolling in which we talked to some of our friends up in the northeast corner of the country. We traded some favorable votes for this ice hockey legislation in return for a seven-game football schedule.

My point is that conscience voting doesn't work. Perhaps we have unconscious voting.

So what we propose to have if reorganization passes would be a maximum of 172 institutions in Division I and 497 institutions in Division II. We would have a common constitution, but with the added flexibility of separate bylaws whereby we can get at a problem that is closer to us and hopefully solve that problem.

Edgar A. Sherman (Muskingum College): Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen: My assignment here is to talk about championships under reorganization. I will say this, as far as competition is concerned, I guess that is why we are all here. That is what reorganization is all about, to try to structure our legislation so we can compete.

Some of the points that I think might be mentioned in reorganization are concerned with several people's feelings that they think we ought to have a third division instead of two divisions. In the questionnaire, some of the people said four divisions. As far as competition, there is no reason we shouldn't have three; there is no reason we shouldn't have four. I think we should have enough divisions that they can get down to the right level. So reorganization will create a method whereby each division shall be responsible for the establishment of its own championship events.

Under this proposed rule change, Division II could create two levels of championships within its own division if it felt that would be appropriate. We have already started with that. We have two levels in football and part of the program proposes to have two in two other sports. This would allow for a third division on the competitive level without the need for a third legislative division at the present time. I can see that it could be possible.

Reorganization would also guarantee in the Bylaws that a certain number of individual champions from the Division II championship might qualify for and compete in the Division I championship.

There has been a movement in recent times to restrict football competition, and the rules allowing for this are contained in the Executive Regulations and could be changed by the Executive Committee

any time they saw fit. Under this proposal the rule will become a part of the Bylaws and can only be changed by the body itself or by vote of the membership.

I think it is also important to re-emphasize the fact that it will give relief, some relief at least, to division Bylaws or rules so that reorganization would open the Division I championship events to schools which may wish to participate in that division in only one or two sports. These institutions will not be required to have the qualifications necessary for Division I membership.

I believe this would give the people in the College Division a better opportunity to promote their own sports and their own championships, and perhaps take away some of that feeling they have of being second-class citizens.

Richard T. Bowers (University of South Florida): I think the College and University Division people pretty much take the same position and argue these various points from time to time, based on their selfish desire and ambitions for athletics.

My particular topic is "Reorganization From the Viewpoint of a College Division Independent."

As a College Division independent, we view this as a more effective way of passing legislation that will best meet the needs and the athletic goals of my particular institution.

Part of the problem we face is the one of the goals and objectives that we have in our institutions, and we must seek the level of competition in order to have some degree of success. We cannot always have our cake and eat it, too, in the extension of the problem; and we cannot be all things to all people.

There has been a tendency for the institution to have greater flexibility in adjusting its programs, in Division I or Division II, than it would if it were in a particular conference. Again that is another level which we cannot jump over and work out the particular problems, and Stan Marshall will elaborate on this later.

I must point out that as College Division members we must face the fact that we cannot try to keep up with the Joneses. The reason for such a reorganization proposal now is because we are charged by most of our presidents to save money. I am sure your presidents asked many of you to vote for financial aid based on need and gave you flexibility on the others.

The present membership of the University Division is about 37 per cent over all, with about 63 per cent in the College Division. Under reorganization this would not change significantly.

The recent placement indicates that about 26 per cent would be in Division I, and about 74 per cent would be in Division II. This still gives the College Division enough members so they can go to a third national competitive division if they so desire, and I would think most of them are thinking along that line at this time. Also the College Division schools have the possibility of placing two sports in Division I championships.

The reorganization, as suggested, does not hamper the scheduling opportunities nor the prestige of the College Division institutions. If we are not satisfied and have higher ambitions in athletics, we must pay the price of qualifying and involving our programs in eight sports, as suggested in the proposal.

Again, what we are attempting to do is provide basic information as

a basis for decision and judgment on your part. We know it is a complex problem, and the issues heretofore have not been given the fullest attention. I think any change is difficult, but if we make a start we can better meet the needs of the institutions we represent; and, as has been pointed out before, maybe we again need to walk before we run.

Stanley J. Marshall (South Dakota State University): Since I have been here, I have been criticized for leading the College Committee for the adoption of a proposal for endorsing reorganization. I have also been criticized for leading the College Committee in a proposal against reorganization. The fact of the matter is we have not discussed it.

We are talking today about reorganization. I am to comment from the point of view of College Division conferences, which of course is impossible because there is no agreement among conferences. There is no agreement within the conferences. There is no agreement within institutions. The presidents many times look at it from the money point only. Very few are concerned at all about reorganization. They want to save money. The faculty representatives, being faculty people, are totally confused. The athletic directors are in a position between them and the coaches, who are afraid they will be saddled with aid based on need.

So we have a great deal of confusion, and I can only indicate what I have developed from talking to people in College Division conferences and tell you what our conference did.

North Central Intercollegiate Athletic Conference voted this fall unanimously to endorse reorganization and the financial aid plan also. I believe we did it because we were under great pressure from our presidents to do something about the rising cost of intercollegiate athletics. We felt we first must deal with reorganization and get ourselves in a better stance to speak to the problems that are relevant to the College Division and may not be to the University Division or some other division.

I would urge your support of the proposals. That is not to say they should be adopted now exactly as written. In fact, the College Committee is in support of one amendment that will come before the group tomorrow, which will be to the advantage of the College Division group and will not hurt the University Division group.

In conclusion, I would make five points:

1. The proposal is to retain the umbrella of the NCAA, and I think we all want that. Many of us at one time belonged to the NAIA, and that is a fine organization. I have no desire to join it again, however.

2. It does give each division flexibility beyond what we now have. It makes it possible for us in the Division to branch out into three or even four, and we are fully aware in the College Division of the great desire for this to happen. As has been mentioned, we are bringing out competition in Division III in championships in basketball and in wrestling, and we have divisional competition at this point in football.

3. It does give us flexibility for those people to work in groups that are somewhat more alike.

4. It provides for a re-evaluation of the makeup of the Council, the Executive Committee and other committees; and this has been a great concern of our College Committee people.

We tend to forget the history of the organization. We have come a long way here. It has taken us a while to get some of the things we

have wanted. But we have gotten most of them. We are getting more of them, and we have had support from the University Division people.

5. The last one, it provides a logical step as a move toward dealing with and controlling the spiraling cost of intercollegiate athletics.

Chairman Barnes: We have three microphones. Direct your question to anyone.

Lloyd Musselman (Oklahoma City University): Our problem is that our enrollment is one-tenth of that of the University of South Florida, and yet we play major competition basketball. Last year we competed in the top ten in tennis.

My concern is with the maximum scholarship award tables, Division I and Division II. I note that on Division II basketball maximum initial award per year, scholarships per year, is listed as four. In Division I it is listed as six.

We presumably will go in Division II, but we will be able to compete in Division I, in tennis and basketball. Does this mean that we will be awarded or allowed the maximum initial award in Division I schools in those two particular sports?

Mr. Swank: On that, the proposal as it is written and the decision of the Council on it is that if an institution is elected as a Division II institution and elects to participate in Division I it will be governed by the limitations of Division I for scholarships.

Mr. Musselman: What we are really dealing with here is the chance for Oklahoma City University to get the benefit of the additional scholarships. According to the Council, you would allow us to get the additional scholarships.

Mr. Swank: Yes, in those two sports, in which you elect to participate.

Jim Bedell (Canisius College): I have a question on reorganization specifically. In the minutes of the Council meeting at which the Special Reorganization Committee was appointed, they suggested three divisions. I notice this was defeated. Is it my understanding that the Council took it upon itself to then submit the proposal for only two divisions in the reorganization? It obviously was not a suggestion of the special committee.

Mr. Koenig: I think I understand your question. David pointed out that the committee did come in initially with the recommendation for three divisions. The Council, upon hearing their report—and this is not unusual for the Council to consider the overall ramifications—decided that at this convention we should strive to settle for two, first, and then let the next step come from there.

Mr. Bedell: Then the Council assumed this responsibility. There seems to be some concern about the composition of the Council in regard to the various College and University Divisions.

You had a Reorganization Committee which I think was fairly representative of both the College Division and the University Division. They made a recommendation of three divisions. The Council with its 15-5 representatives of the University and College Division voted to override that particular suggestion and took it upon themselves to go to two.

The Council reduced the number from the report of this Committee from three to two. I think the Council should define the means whereby we can reorganize into three competitive divisions.

Mr. Koenig: I don't want to speak for or defend the representation

of the Council. This body elected the Council. You have heard the statistics that I cited at previous conventions. You can make your own decision what a representative body means here. Some statistics show that, say, 240 University Division members have undergraduate male enrollment of over 1,400,000. Of course, you can take statistics and play with them. If you take it on the basis of the number of schools involved, I am sure others can take exception to that.

I don't quite know how to answer your comment.

Mr. Bedell: I am not trying to play a statistical game. I am not saying because there are more members of the University Division on the Council, they are not seriously considering philosophically what happens in the colleges. But I think it goes back to what was said earlier. I think it is very difficult to resolve this when a committee suggests something, and the Council disapproves it and gives the reason that there is not enough time because we are getting an increase of all our problems in reorganization. I think that is the reason you have the feeling.

Mr. Swank: Let me make a comment on that, because our committee made the recommendation for three divisions. Actually, when we took this to the Council, one of the reasons it changed our plan from three to two was a concern on the part of some of our College Division members. Those people who were representing the College Division on the Council said they don't need three legislative divisions. What they want is three competitive divisions. Let's take a look and see how three competitive divisions will work, and then if necessary in future meetings we can adopt the third legislative division.

I think I can speak for most of the University people on this Council. When we were told that many of the College Division people don't want us to be dividing up the College Division into two groups, we took their recommendation.

Dave Nelson (University of Delaware): I am very much for reorganization. I have been for a long time. I think we have to have divisions. It is a matter of timing, what sacrifices we have to make to get it, when you have it, the idea you buy now and pay later. For that reason I think the time is now. I think we have a program we can live with. There are not a great many objections to it.

I don't think we can solve this thing too fast. We have gone through this in the past. The 1,600 is an example. We have had more amendments to that than there are to the United States Constitution. We have finally got to the situation where we may drop it and we may not, but there has been a lot of criticism of the program. It is not clear just exactly what is going on.

But out of all of this, I think there are two things that are very clear. The purpose of reorganization and the purpose of the Reorganization Committee was to present legislation for self-determination, competitively and legislatively. The folks on the panel say we have that. I say we do not. In fact, we don't have it here in the legislation attempting to get reorganization. We have more restrictive legislation, more restrictive in the sense that it reduces participation which has been available in the Constitution of the NCAA.

Self-determination apparently is to be terminated because we delete "through process of institutional self-determination."

I say this is more restrictive than the "fish and fowl" rule where you decided whether you were University or College Division. Now

you are told whether you are fish or fowl. That is the difference.

I think in the NCAA championship competition we should have eligibility rules. I think 1,600 is an example. There is exactly the same problem.

According to one of the proposals, we cannot have any legislation that is more liberal. How is this self-determination? We have rules that are restrictive and restrict participation. I don't think this is self-determination. If one group or the other wants restrictive legislation, they should be able to have it. If they don't, they don't have self-determination. If they have it, they have self-determination.

Under the present rule, if you took this more liberal legislation and put it back, Division I would have one vote; and Division II would have one vote; and you would have a standoff.

To summarize, someone at the table said they urged support of reorganization. I would say that enabling legislation for reorganization will not go away. It is going to be here next year. You will decide here we have to come away with something, and we have to start. I don't believe that.

I think of this analogy. The mother sent her boy to the store for a loaf of bread. They are out of bread and he comes back with a can of codfish.

I think that is what we may be doing. I think we can get reorganization. We are well aware of what we have to do, and it can be done. I think in another year these proposals will still be there. Do we want membership more restrictive, no self-determination, no change in competition? I think we can get reorganization next year.

I think this is the most far-reaching legislation since 1951 when the Constitution was changed and it should be reorganization by self-determination.

Peter A. Carlesimo (Fordham University): We are opposed to reorganization.

We sponsored 10 varsity sports last year. In 1973 we will sponsor 12. In football probably 90 per cent of our schedule is with Division I teams.

I should also add that on the basis of past performance we would be interested in national competition in four sports in one year. So if I had been able to select the category or division in which to compete, it would have been Division I.

We are in Category C, in the College Division instead of the University Division.

Ernest B. McCoy (University of Miami, Florida): This legislation really bothers me. For the first time in many years in the NCAA in intercollegiate athletics we are running into new requirements which I know you have heard discussed before.

I think the NCAA existed for 50 years, from 1906 to 1956, before the first requirement was put in, that was in the Constitution. For membership in the NCAA we have to sponsor four sports including one in each of the three sports seasons.

The institution I now represent would have to put in eight intercollegiate sports rather than four, which was required in the past.

I don't think there is anybody in this room who wouldn't add more opportunities in intercollegiate athletics to his program as long as his facilities provided. For the first time, we are being told what we have to do in order to remain in Division I.

Our university is a private institution. We receive no tax dollars. We take great pride in the fact that we produce representative teams. We haven't got a full scholarship in any sport other than football. Yet in the last three years we have had four of our teams—baseball, tennis, golf and swimming—qualified for national championships, and we have placed in tennis and baseball.

Now if my category changes because we can't afford to add any more teams to our sports program, I don't know which two teams I will select that I know can qualify for national championship.

I have sat in these conventions for many years and for the past five or six we have talked about finding ways and means to reduce costs in our program. Everything that I have heard from the NCAA or any place else has emphasized the financial difficulties in education, especially in intercollegiate athletics; and each of us know some of our friends have had to drop programs that they regretted dropping.

Now suddenly, Miami and quite a few institutions, who do not sponsor eight sports, either have to add to our overall costs somewhere, or play in a Division where we haven't played before.

I think we belong in Division I. We don't have basketball. We had to drop that because of the extreme cost. In the southern part of Miami, or the peninsula, we don't have contiguous states around us that we can compete with. We have to go north, which is very expensive.

No one can tell me adding to our sports won't cost money. We have to have coaches, equipment, playing facilities, and money to travel.

Now it can be argued that if the numbers game passes in the convention, the true savings of the football program will be to add more sports to our program. This is very true, but that is not adding money for our various types of program under any circumstances.

We have spent four or five years in this convention, trying to find ways and means of relieving the financial burden of our institutions; and for the first time we are saying, some of us at least, that we want to stay in the Division where we have been all these years.

I raise the question: Why do we subject a new yardstick to self-determination? What is wrong with the rules we have had?

I agree thoroughly with the philosophy of legislative reorganization but not the way it is written today.

I would hope that in this august body there might be enough votes to defeat the demand that we either have to increase our costs or change Division.

I am not too sure that in our institution, or many of yours, the faculty or staff who are not receiving aid increases, indeed the heads of departments are receiving orders to reduce their costs, are going to look with favor when they read in the newspapers that we have to add to the cost of the intercollegiate athletic program. We have enough opposition now. We don't need any more.

I believe we should compete in the University Division. We opened with Texas, Florida State, Oklahoma. We closed with Alabama, Florida and Notre Dame.

Gentlemen, these are important conferences, but I don't think it is necessary to add this burden to some of us who are struggling to stay in business.

Delegate: There are several points I would like to argue with. One has the feeling that one group is trying to do something to the other group. I don't think that is the history of this organization. I think we have

always worked together, both the College Division and the University Division. I think we can count on that in the future.

The other point I don't agree with is apparently some people think it is better to be in Division I than in Division II. That is the worst part of the proposal. You could call it Red Bird or Blue Bird, something other than Division I and Division II which might indicate that one is better than the other.

I think the important point is that we lost our way in the problem last year in Miami, and a growing number of people in the general public, in other places in higher education and others are saying the NCAA cannot solve its own problems. I think if we lose our way again, we are going to prove they are right.

Michael M. Fleischer (Herbert H. Lehman College): Am I correct in assuming that under the proposed legislation in reorganization, unless both Divisions concur, less restrictive legislation may not be passed by one Division? Is that correct?

Mr. Swank: That is correct.

Mr. Fleischer: Which means we are changing what we have done for the past several years. I was wondering if someone on the panel could give the philosophical reason for the change we are contemplating here.

Mr. Swank: Actually the present feature is set by conscience voting. There is nothing that allows one Division to adopt legislation by itself. Now the reason for the committee's coming in with this type of proposal—and this was not changed by the Council—was to set up federated system, if you want to call it that. It's system of some check and balance between the two divisions, so if the University Division or Division I might want to go overboard and do a certain thing, Division II or the College Division would have some control; and likewise if the College Division was going out to be much more liberal and the University Division felt it wasn't good for intercollegiate athletics, Division I or the University Division would have some control.

Mr. Fleischer: That in effect changes the practice that we have been under for the past few years.

With the conscience voting which was practiced we did allow each division to establish somewhat its own rules. In effect, now we would not.

Mr. Swank: Sometimes it is a point of conscience in your decision on that.

I think the same thing exists today. If the College Division or Division II would make a proposal on loosening up or allowing freshmen and present it in that fashion, you would find the Division I people doing exactly the same thing they did. It's your problem. Establish what you want, give it good legislation. But there are kinds of legislation that could be adopted that one Division would feel are bad as far as their program or the overall NCAA is concerned. On those recommendations they would have the right to reject.

Mr. Fleischer: Why do you say only on less restrictive legislation, which means that a Division could adopt something that is more restrictive and yet have no veto from the other division on that. Can you give the reason for this negative approach?

Mr. Swank: If one Division wants to tighten up on itself, let it do it. We don't feel that in those instances which would be more restrictive on the University Division or Division I, the College Division or Di-

vision II would really care.

Mr. Fleischer: It seems to me we are saying if we make it more restrictive that is good, we can let that happen; if we get a little more liberal in one Division that may not be good. It seems to me it is a negative approach in the reorganization of this body. We should really go into a more positive approach in athletics, not the negative.

Carl Abner (University of Louisville): The question I have is: Why does the Council try, in Financial Aid Limitations, to have two award divisions?

There are many of us who are in favor of the financial award limitation, but some who might be opposed to divisional reorganization. Now, if we defeat divisional reorganization, the financial aid limitation would go out as well.

Mr. Swank: No. Where is the parliamentarian? As I understand it, if reorganization would be defeated, we could still vote on financial aid limitation and on need. You have two phases that are represented.

Franklin A. Lindenberg (University of California, Riverside): I would like to return to dealing with the revision of the Bylaws.

I return to the other gentleman's point of view, the fact that if we had 200 voting members in Division I and 200 voting members in Division II, at any one legislative convention, it would be possible for either one of the two Divisions to vote down a less restrictive proposal by producing 101 votes. Approximately one-fourth of the group voting could turn the proposal down. Is that correct?

Mr. Swank: If it is more restrictive, the answer is, No. If it is less restrictive the answer is, Yes. Division I or Division II, either one, could turn down the proposal that was passed unanimously by the other division. That was the intention in writing the legislation.

Mr. Lindenberg: Mr. Chairman, should the reorganization pass tomorrow, I would be prepared to present an amendment I believe would be in order, that such a thing would not be possible, that the general session be recorded, that the entire group would vote and the majority would rule.

Mr. Marshall: Frank Lindenberg's proposal was brought up in the College Committee and passed, and the Council defeated it narrowly. We resubmitted it through the proper avenues, and there will be an opportunity to vote on the amendment tomorrow.

Mr. Swank: If that amendment were adopted, you would have more liberal Bylaws, which you could achieve by the majority vote of the entire body. For the more restrictive Bylaws, each Division could adopt those on their own.

Joseph H. Ruetz (Stanford University): One thing concerns me. You raised a point that seems to be creating great controversy. I would like to know what is the logic in setting a minimum number of eight sports for Division I and four for Division II.

Mr. Swank: As far as Division I is concerned at least, the committee felt the logic for it is that in Division I the Division should be more compatible within itself; so the schools in that Division are more representative if they have the same type of program.

To be very frank about it, the figure eight was picked up out of the air because the majority of the member institutions which were predicted to be in Division I would have eight or more sports.

The Reorganization Committee felt if we wanted to provide the greatest competitive opportunity, some of the institutions might be

required to add a sport or two. I am not suggesting football, basketball or baseball. Most of them have those, but some others, what we refer to generally as non-resident sports, might be added without substantial increase in cost. Many are encouraging the development of club sports. Some of these might move into the NCAA sports to help them qualify.

The average number of sports sponsored by the member institutions in the University Division in this Association is 9.5. The average number in the College Division is 8.9.

Robert M. Whitelaw (Eastern College Athletic Conference): Does the Council intend to submit any amendment to the enabling amendment or any subsequent proposal to bring before the organization in the convention?

Mr. Swank: There has been one other amendment in your material dealing with reorganization. In the section concerning the request for a change in Division, the second or third full sentence, that now reads: "The Council, subsequent to that August 1 and prior to the following January 1, shall determine, in accordance with the above criteria, if the member's Division should be changed."

The Council will propose an amendment to that so that by striking "in accordance with" and the words "with the above criteria" and substitute words so it will generally be in substantial compliance with the above criteria.

The Council under this proposal then could say, if you qualify for Division I now, there is no sense in requiring you to remain in Division II for a period of a year or two while you are in the process of transition.

The same thing might be true with the institution that says they are going to proceed to have a major program in football or basketball. Right now their schedule might be 30 per cent against Division I members. Next year or the year following they may have contracted 50 per cent or more schedules against Division I members.

Under this amendment the Council will propose, the Council could allow them Division I membership immediately.

I understand the Big Ten has an amendment concerning amendments to Bylaws. Would anyone like to speak as to what that amendment would be?

Robert Ray (University of Iowa): The proposal of the Big Ten would strike the language following the word "Bylaw." We would put a period after the word "Bylaw" so that it would read: "Each division of the Association may at any Convention, by a majority vote of the members of such division present and voting, adopt or amend any Bylaw."

Our thinking is that the Constitution would then become the umbrella to which you referred in your remarks. The Bylaws then would apply to either division, regardless of whether the amendment was more or less. I take it, in a sense, that is what the College Division is trying to get at, by suggesting that the term "respectively" be eliminated so that in fact you have a way of getting the Bylaws amended if they are less restrictive. Their proposal would be to have less restrictive amendments considered by Division I and Division II sitting jointly.

The Big Ten proposal is that the Constitution become the umbrella. Neither Division could adopt any legislation in Bylaw form that would

be contrary to the Constitution. But both Divisions could adopt Bylaws that would be less restrictive, or more restrictive.

I am not sure what the procedure will be with regard to this proposed amendment. I take it the College Division's amendment to strike "respectively" is in order. The amendment of the Big Ten should be in order.

Mr. Swank: One thing I think we should consider in looking at the Big Ten amendment and the proposed College Division amendment.

On the one hand we have the structure as it is presented in amendments to Bylaws. On the other hand, we have the structure that is presented by the Big Ten. And in the middle the College Committee recommendation is sort of a middle ground. So on the one hand we have veto power by one Division over the other. On the other hand we have total autonomy by each division. And in the middle ground we have the majority rule that we have right now.

But I ask you to consider one thing, in looking at the total autonomy concept proposed by the Big Ten. One of the reasons the Council did not present this was because there was fear on the part of the Council that the Constitution would not provide a complete umbrella; and if we were allowed to go our various ways and adopt all kinds of Bylaws more liberal than the other Division, we would have the Association growing apart. This was the whole purpose of the Council; we did not want the Association to grow apart. We felt there was a very vital reason why we have the major universities and we have the smaller institutions all in here together, listening to one another, talking over our problems with one another, and then voting where we can see what each other is doing. It was our fear that by adopting this more liberal proposal we would slip; and where that slip would end, we don't know.

Ernie Casale (Temple University): As a University member of the Council, we thought we were doing what the College people wanted in making it two legislative divisions and three competitive divisions rather than three across the board.

The other comment I would like to make is you may or may not be in a conference of the University Division.

As to the method of getting into Division I, there is an arbitrary process set up. There is a formula. If you are lucky enough to have that now, you of course qualify for Division I. If you are in a conference where the majority of your members qualify under the formula, then you are much better off. The opposite case is not true. If you qualify for Division I and are in a Division II conference you can't stay there because the majority of the schools do not qualify.

Mr. Koenig: In the discussion it has been assumed that reorganization would pass. I think the financial aid proposal and reorganization have been mixed in some comments.

I think many of you probably now receive the ECAC fact sheets, and you will note in there that several of the comments had to do with the effect on restricting competition.

I submit it may be a valid argument. I would like to see that point considered by Divisions. There are at least four very significant proposals on financial aid. You have heard already from the floor here the question: Why were they tied together? I hope everybody leaves this room, knowing they are not tied together. If reorganization is voted in, each Division will have an opportunity to consider the merits

of the four and eight sport proposal as it applies to its own Division.

Mr. Swank: I think there are a number of statements about the ECAC fact sheet that we might discuss. Of course, number one, is they say we are creating a super elite. I don't think 170 institutions in the country are exactly a super elite, since this is substantially more than frequently are classified for major in either football or basketball.

There was also a comment that we are going to exclude by the establishment of the criteria for Division I institutions from Division I championship. That is not true. Under the reorganization proposal, anyone meeting the criteria can participate in Division I; and the College Division people, Division II, can only compete in Division II sports. They always have the opportunity if they meet those criteria, to move up into Division I.

Some questions have been raised about the limitations and need. If you should vote for reorganization tomorrow, you have to consider the limitations on numbers, and the need, and vote on them as constitutional amendments.

In other words, you have to create an enabling piece of legislation that would be required to have a two-thirds majority of this entire body. So before any need or any limitation, we will have to have two-thirds of this body voting for it before we ever get it set up in the Bylaws.

David Orcorr (University of Scranton): A question. Under reorganization, is your committee proposing a detailed proportionate plan for the reorganization of the Council?

Mr. Swank: There are three divisions. It wasn't exact.

What we did was create a vice-president for each Division, Division II and III, to insure that they would always have a vice-president.

We also set aside certain member-at-large spots for Division II and Division III members, so there would be no way that Division II and Division III members would be left without membership on the Council.

It wasn't a one man one vote situation. We did not try to do that.

Delegate: We are a school of seven to eight years and 20,000 students. We won't be in a position for at least a decade to have a major football or probably basketball program; but ten years from now, we will probably aspire to the so-called Division I classification.

The pragmatic of the coming Division I seems to be quite difficult, that is to say, scheduling the so-called major football teams, major basketball teams, etc. It takes about seven years to do that and establish it part of the program.

Mr. Swank: I would hate to comment on what is going to be the case ten years from now. With reorganization, I can't tell you what will be there in two or three years because I think this is going to grow somewhat. The criteria may change. So I would say for the institution that wants to move toward Division I we would have a schedule for that, increasing the number of sports.

Gordan Chalmers (Indiana State University): I would like to know, as it stands right now why we are in two divisions and not three? There are those of us who are definitely College, there are those of us who are definitely University, and there are those of us who are in between.

Should those of us who play about 30 or 40 per cent of our present football schedule major be reduced by the present table that we are

faced with right now—65 players—and still have to continue to play a football schedule which is figured ten years in advance against people who will have 105 players?

This is rather an inequity. Certainly it will create a great problem in trying to win or trying to keep the program on an even keel.

Mr. Gilstrap: I can perhaps speak to that point, having been through the ordeal of achieving major status in the last few years. I will say it is a problem of the coaches.

I would point out that the requirements for Class or Division I membership, as far as football or basketball is concerned, as proposed, are less demanding than those that were held out for classification in the rule book changes.

Mr. Chalmers: I don't think that quite answers the problem. If you have 65 football players, how are you going to play against 105?

Mr. Swank: I think there is a solution. You have the same situation in Illinois State. If you are moving to that and you will be in compliance with it, I cannot say what the Council will do in three years or four years, or what they are going to say; but if that is the situation and you are not going to qualify now, there is the other provision that in the event you cannot do that, and you want to move up into Division I in football and one other sport, you may ask the Council for permission to participate in Division I. If your program is one that is evolving, the Council can certify you for Division I in football; and you will be playing not in Division II but in Division I.

Mr. Chalmers: I think perhaps from the standpoint of everyone's concern, it might be a little more equitable if it read instead of football and basketball, football or basketball. Then I think you would solve the problem of a great number of people and allow them to participate in the University Division.

For example, I happen to have a good wrestling team; and I qualify in basketball and baseball, but not for a number of years in football. I have a good gymnastics team, also.

Mr. Swank: Maybe I don't understand your problem, but to me there is nothing wrong with being in Division II and winning Division II national championships.

Mr. Chalmers: When you have Division II and Division I you have set a standard by which everybody probably would operate. I think when you say you can have two of your teams in Division I, then you definitely say Division II is second-class because the only national championship then is in Division I.

Mr. Koenig: I know how we would feel at Valparaiso, and I am sure a lot of others in Division II would feel the same way. I want to submit, that is one of the things we think we have covered in this proposal.

It is true we call for highest championship only in basketball and cross country, but I remind you that is exactly the way the College Division started—first basketball, then cross country, and then the other eight or nine sports that can follow.

So there is nothing, if reorganization were to go through, that would keep Division II from doing the same thing that we are suggesting in basketball and cross country; and at the very next convention, individual members of Division II or the College Committee, or whatever that is called under restructuring, would be able to come into the Division, I or II, and just go across the board with other

national championships that are possible under this proposal.

Chairman Barnes: We will go into the second part of the program which has to do with the question of need and candidate's declaration procedure.

On the stage now we have Wade Stinson, Kansas; Alan Chapman, Rice; Ernie Casale, Temple; William Flynn, Boston; Harry Cross, Washington, and Kenneth Vickery, Clemson.

They are going to talk on numbers, need and candidate's declaration. We are going to ask Mr. Stinson to be the spokesman for this group.

Wade Stinson (University of Kansas): I will make a few remarks about the particular subject involved and turn it over for questions from you, and we will hope we can answer your questions.

The history of the Financial Aid Committee, as you know, is similar to that of the Reorganization Committee. The first presentation was last year, as far as I understand, at the Convention. Bill Flynn was chairman at that time. The Council decided to submit to this Convention the proposals, which will indicate how the subcommittee was formed, investigated them, and refined them in the manner they are at this point. I would add also, as the previous committee did, that we do not have all the answers to all things.

The one-year award is one item. Financial limitations on number is another item. There is one other item.

I would add that when this proposal is offered on the floor as a package for adoption, I will request that the basketball and football limitations be voted as a separate piece of legislation from the other reports.

In the amendment eliminate "practice or" and underline "varsity."

I think that may have special meaning to many of you. Varsity means varsity, and does not mean subvarsity or sub-subvarsity.

The third part of the package, if you will, is determination of financial need, and finally candidate's acceptance form.

I am not going into any further detail. There may be some things I have not touched on, that some of the other members will mention. All of the answers aren't here, but we think there are a good number of answers; and we think it is good legislation, enough to start on and live with for a year.

Donald Warhurst (California State Polytechnic University): In regard to Financial Aid Limitation, my water polo coach has asked a question.

All teams at our university who play water polo have been recruited by the water polo coach. They will receive no financial aid, but they have been recruited under O.I. 100.

Now, according to the way I read this thing, according to the Maximum Award Table for Division II, water polo is allowed four continuing players and two new ones. Does that mean we can have only six players?

Mr. Flynn: Sir, for the first year the initial awards are based on educational equivalents, so you could have two educational equivalents and that would be 100 in water polo players the first year.

Mr. Warhurst: It says intercollegiate competition. You have to count them.

Mr. Flynn: You do have to count them, but the first year you don't count them as individuals. You count them based on educational

equivalent. If you have ten people getting aid, their aid adds up to one educational equivalent. That is the first year.

That is the way I understand it. Beginning the second year, freshmen or otherwise, you count them as individuals and not as educational equivalent.

Mr. Warhurst: It doesn't say that in the proposed legislation. He was recruited and he engaged in intercollegiate competition.

Mr. Flynn: That is correct, but this is different. The method of counting in the first year is different than the method of counting in the second or third year. The first year we say you count people on the basis of educational equivalent, and the second or third year you count them as individuals.

Ross H. Smith (Massachusetts Institute of Technology): I have a question on the same topic. It could be any one of several of course. It has concerned some of our lacrosse players. Regardless of the way you provide the equivalent that Bill Flynn speaks about, it would be difficult to arrive at a squad and be able to have a lacrosse game without some relaxation, as I see it, in O.I. 100.

If the Council is contemplating that, I would like to suggest for one thing that the telephone contact be eliminated. If this would be removed in our institution and certainly in a number of institutions, it would remove the recruited title requirement to be counted under the quota.

The second would be the definition of financial aid, to make financial aid specifically a grant-in-aid and an athletic grant-in-aid.

I really think the numbers quotas as they are presented create illogicals for many of us who have programs, say, in hockey. We normally travel and compete in nine countries in three events. We could only use, as I see it, eight men; and we would have to require doubling.

I really don't think what Bill Flynn talks about meets the need.

Mr. Stinson: I think it is entirely in order—I know we have discussed it in Council meeting—that O.I. 100 possibly needs some revision sometime. This may not be the time to do it, but I certainly think it will be revised in time.

J. D. Morgan (University of California, Los Angeles): I would like to ask the committee to about the time changing from the first year, where you can fragment a full squad and have to every year thereafter count individuals rather than full value scholarship. I am disturbed about this change.

We have 18 full varsity units in sports in my university, and after you get past the first four or five, almost every sport that we see based thereafter is fragmented not only in the first year but it is heavily fragmented in every year thereafter.

There are two things I see in the numbers game as it is played here that bother me. One is the run-off problem. The other is more participation by more youngsters helping them as far as you possibly can.

In view of this, I would like to know the reasoning behind this, that after the first year you must count each individual who receives aid.

Mr. Stinson: I would say it is strictly the philosophy of saving money.

Mr. Morgan: At the expense of possibly run-off and at the expense

of a possibility of participation by helping youngsters.

Mr. Stinson: We decided to lick the run-off problem, and we felt in the committee that very soon the run-off as utilized would be over.

Mr. Morgan: I believe this is the most dangerous thing I have heard. You do not solve the problem after you have created it. You attempt not to create the problem, and if the philosophy of the dollar has taken over on our philosophy of participation and participation on the level of ideals that we have supported, then we are in poor shape.

Mr. Stinson: Alan Chapman indicates to me there is an amendment to be presented I believe to make it equivalent all the way across the board. Is that correct?

I understand it is the stipulation other than football or basketball. **Tom Warner** (Butler University): We have a unique problem in that we work with the University Division in basketball and fully intend to do so if we are permitted.

If we were to go to two sports, let's say basketball and baseball, where the University Division or the College Division would go to full funding, and the Division II adopted the need program, what would happen to a young man who is a dual participant, let's say in baseball and football? Now, would he be declared ineligible for football because he received a full scholarship in baseball? The baseball scholarship is based on ability, and the football would have to be based on need.

Mr. Stinson: I believe you would have to go to the rule of the Division in which you are playing that sport.

Mr. Warner: In other words, the boy would be unable to participate in football if he received aid in baseball.

Mr. Stinson: He would have to be counted as football.

Mr. Warner: But baseball would not be need. It would be based on ability.

My point in asking this question is that it is quite obvious that it opens up mercenary recruiting in the College Division.

Panelist: It appears to me you have to follow the opinion of the student who wishes to participate in the sport.

Panelist: If the NCAA has one championship—it might be lacrosse or ice hockey, as an example, suppose Division I passes some number limitation and Division II does not, would the numbers limitation be applicable to those in Division II if they fail to pass a numbers limitation?

Mr. Stinson: I don't believe so.

Panelist: That means they would be available to go out and recruit. **Robert A. Latour** (Bucknell University): I have a question for Division II. Can a swimming squad, for example, have a maximum of 13 members, assuming they are all recruited; and in the golf team can have only six members on the squad? Is that correct?

Mr. Stinson: If they are all full grants, you can only have 13. If they are awards though you can split those and use the educational equivalent.

Mr. Latour: Let's assume we don't give any grants-in-aid for swimming or cross country in my institution. All the men in the squad are recruited; let's say registered by the coach. You have 18 up here for the squad. Would we be limited to 13?

Mr. Stinson: Yes, if you are recruiting them, and they play on the varsity team.

Let me clarify that for a minute. Once they play, they have to be counted; and they fall into the counted category. You can have any number until they are on the track.

Mr. Latour: You have six tennis players on your varsity squad?

Mr. Stinson: If they are in the counted category.

I don't know whether there have been any amendments to this or not. The committee thoroughly expected some amendments.

Donald Garrity (California State University, San Francisco): I speak on behalf of my university, and I am sure I represent my colleagues in the Far Western Conference. I feel sure I share the view of my colleague from Cal Poly who asked the questions in regard to the water polo team.

I would like to make quite clear our concern on this drastic legislation. We understand the intent of the legislation, in terms of limitations of financial aid. But it is very drastic legislation when it applies to institutions such as our own and others in our conference.

We encourage our coaches and other persons associated with our university to recruit students. Under this legislation you would limit the size of our team in quality sports, and we offer programs in quality sports. Our philosophy is that in these things we would maximize the number of participants; and we believe that in your effort to limit financial aid, you have intruded in an area where we are attempting to expand upon the fundamental philosophy of the NCAA and maximize competition.

Gordon Chalmers: (Indiana State University): I don't know where some of these figures came from that are on this Maximum Awards Table. To my mind, some of them must have been guesswork.

Mr. Stinson: That is very possible.

Mr. Chalmers: Being a member of the Gymnastics Rules Committee, I note there are three awards the first year and seven, which makes a total of ten. The committee recently stated that the minimum number of people who could operate in a dual meet without going to a total specialist program, which we are not permitted to do, would be twelve. Here we are trying to operate a national program with ten.

I would submit to you the same thing in swimming. To operate with thirteen swimmers today is not realistic. It cannot be done.

Robert M. Whitelaw (Eastern College Athletic Conference): I am again representing our ECAC colleges. I think our great concern is the broad application of financial aid counting, that students now on the campus who have been recruited without grants-in-aid have to be counted, those who have come through regular channels. I think that is clearly a broad application of financial aid.

Mr. Stinson: You know, there is one item, that if the student-athlete is really not recruited, if he is recruited without any athletic ability in mind, it really doesn't apply.

Mr. Whitelaw: Why does it apply to those not under financial aid?

Chairman Barnes: There are six persons up here, and any questions you have should be directed to any person on the rostrum. I would ask you to do that, if you will. For instance, Bill Flynn might answer, and if he wants to, Bill can pass it over to Harry. We want to give you the benefit of all the persons up here.

May I call your attention to the fact that it is 5 o'clock? I don't want to cut you off. By the same token, I don't want you to go out

of here saying Sam Barnes cut you off. We will go on if you want to. I just want you to note the time here. Let your conscience be your guide.

Mr. Casale: If I understand the question, why is it this applies to financial rules. We have discussed this quite a bit, and the answer to that is that if that were not so I think those not under aid rule would have the advantage of being allowed to recruit as many as they wanted. They would be allowed to have as many athletes as they would like to have and there would be no limit.

Corey Van Fleet (Oakland University): In Michigan the financial resources of the university are determined by the students in large measure. The coaching staff as well as all people in the university are pressured to meet with the young people and keep in contact with them in attempting to maintain the level of projection. If we fail to make those projections they are deducted from next year's package. It behooves us to have many people at the university, whether it be coaches, professors or the president, contacting individuals.

I think this perhaps is at the heart of the College Division problem.

We are talking to our students, whether they ever compete in athletics or not, but by the very fact that we do talk to them it comes under O.I. 100. We also get into numbers.

I don't think it is fair to the student or to the people in the special project program who go out and talk, when it does not involve athletic ability, and then turn around after the first year and say, "I am sorry but you can't compete any more. We will be glad to have you stay here." I don't think we are being fair to these young people.

Mr. Casale: This is recruiting. I don't think that falls in the category you are talking about.

Mr. Van Fleet: It is the coaches. I as athletic director or one of my coaches at a ball game sees two or three students. They know they will never compete, he knows they will never compete, but he talks them into coming because he understands they are 2.5 and pre-med. We will do everything we can to get that boy on our campus. If the boy decides to come out and does get in one ball game, we have to tell him he can never play again.

Lloyd Musselman (Oklahoma City University): It seems that in this discussion we might put the cart before the horse. Before we seriously consider perhaps accepting the numbers that have been proposed, we have to revise the interpretation of O.I. 100. Then we will be so severely straitjacketing our program, our whole athletic program, that it will seem to be what we hope it should be, without that.

Chairman Barnes: Thank you, gentlemen. That closes the afternoon session.

[The session adjourned at 5:05 p.m.]

HONORS LUNCHEON

Friday, January 12, 1973

The Honors Luncheon was held in the Grand/State Ballrooms of the Palmer House, Earl M. Ramer, University of Tennessee and President of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, presiding.

President Ramer: Ladies and gentlemen, Jack Brickhouse requested that I cut his introduction short. He said, "Just tell them that I am too lazy to work and too proud to steal."

Jack, I am not going to comply with that request. It will be short, but it will not be that short.

I have found in our informal discussions today that Jack Brickhouse has an ancestral background in Tennessee. I might add, Jack, that I am joined by all the fellow Tennesseans in honoring those ancestral backgrounds. I have only one suggestion, that you spend a little more of the Yankee time you have with good southerners down there.

Our master of ceremonies today is certainly one of the most honored sports announcers in the country. He was honored in 1969 as Broadcasting Man of the Year by the Chicago Sun-Times. In 1968 he received the Communications Award of the Lincoln Ad Convocation in Springfield, Illinois; and several times he has been named the best sports announcer by the American College of Radio Arts and Sciences. The National Sportscasters and Sports Writers Awards Committee has five times named him the outstanding sportscaster of the year in the state of Illinois. He has won a number of Emmy Awards from the Academy of Television Arts and Sciences, as well as numerous other awards.

He entered the broadcasting profession at the age of 18 on Radio Station KWN-NBC in his home town of Peoria, and at this time was the youngest sports announcer in the nation. Six years later he joined WGN in Chicago to cover sports for the Mutual Network on WGN. Today he is vice-president and manager of sports for the WGN Continental Group Stations.

In addition to his regular broadcasts and telecasts, he is the voice of the Chicago Cubs baseball team and covers almost every major sports event in the country.

He has also been active in the political scene, covering several Democratic and Republican conventions, and the Inaugural in Washington in 1969. The highlight of his career was the broadcast of the Papal audience.

He has also been involved in writing on the baseball scene. He has written for the Chicago Daily News and the Chicago Tribune.

He served in the United States Marine Corps and is on the National Board of Directors of the City of Hope.

In 1966 the City of Chicago named him Man of the Year.

His honors and achievements are legion, and you can see why; therefore, it gives me great pleasure to introduce to you our Master of Ceremonies, Jack Brickhouse. [Applause]

Toastmaster Brickhouse: Thank you very much, Dr. Ramer. When

Jerry Miles got hold of me he said, "Move this thing along." I certainly am going to do it.

I do want to say at the outset that it is a pleasure to be associated with such a well organized and well oiled machine as we are looking at today. The world I come from, the world of professional sports, doesn't always have things so well organized. For example, Casey Stengel, who is one of my colleagues, I guess you could say, must have shaken them up one time when he said, "Now, boys, I would like to have you line up alphabetically according to size." [Laughter]

You understand, too, I do appreciate a chance to visit with a winning organization, such as we have today. Things haven't always been that good the last year in Chicago. The Cubs blew it. The White Sox blew it. The Blackhawks blew it. The Chicago Bulls blew it. I am associated with all of them. Northwestern blew it. My own school, Bradley, gave up on football. I called Charles Orsborn, and he hung up on me. [Laughter]

You can't let it worry you too much, like he said, "I am not going to let a season like this worry me a bit. I sleep like a baby. I sleep an hour and wake up and cry for an hour." [Laughter]

Jerry Miles said, "Dress is formal, but in color." You have to think that one over. I picked this suit, and I am glad I did. I hope it is suitable. Actually I got two of them; they guy didn't have change for a twenty. [Laughter]

I come from Peoria. Art Bergstrom, of the NCAA, is the one who contacted me to begin with. We are old friends. I don't know whether you know it or not; but you see Art, before he came to the NCAA, was director of athletics at Bradley, which is my old school, in Peoria, Illinois. But Art moved on. One day they just wrecked his recruiting program. They put in a revolutionary requirement academically that they were not going to award a varsity letter to any athlete who could not identify the winner. [Laughter]

But Art made his mark down there. For example, he was the first guy in the athletic department to work with brown and white shoes—until he lost the brown one. [Laughter]

Bradley was quite a spot. I wouldn't trade those great old days down there for anything. I remember Dr. Abegg touring the campus with some visitors; and somebody asked, "How many students do you have?"

He said, "Oh, about one in a hundred." [Laughter]

We learned a lot of things down there at Bradley.

For instance, I won an award down there myself once for being the only fellow who could get rid of a six-pack during an instant replay. [Laughter]

One thing we learned down there was confidence. You have to have that, as you know, in the world of sports and in this world of education today.

You have heard the story of the three little nuns who ran out of gas on a desert road one day. One of them hitchhiked to a filling station, and this young fellow running the station was a very nice guy. He said, "Sister, my loaner cans are all gone; but I have a 12-month-old lad here. Take the potty, fill it up and take the pickup truck. At least this will get you back to the station."

So the three little nuns are standing over the gas tank and pouring. All of a sudden comes a big Irish truck driver; and he leans out of

the cab window, a laugh on his face, and says, "Sisters, I wish I had your faith." [Laughter]

I also have a very enjoyable assignment here at the very outset, because I get to introduce the representatives of the affiliated members of the NCAA who are meeting during this convention; and of course each member plays a very important role in intercollegiate athletics.

First, the incoming president of the American Association of College Baseball Coaches, John Winklin of Colby College.

Representing the College Athletic Business Managers Association, President John O'Neil of Georgia Tech, and First Vice President James S. Pittinger of the University of Nebraska.

We have the president of the College Sports Information Directors of America, Jim Mott.

From the Collegiate Commissioners Association, the Commissioner of the Southern Conference, President Lloyd Jordan.

From Michigan State, the president of the Intercollegiate Tennis Coaches Association, Stan Drobac.

Representing the National Fencing Coaches Association, from the University of Notre Dame, President Mike DeCicco.

From the National Football Foundation and Hall of Fame, the executive director, Jim MacDonald.

The executive director of the American Football Coaches Association, Bill Murray. Also the just newly-elected president of the American Football Coaches Association—and incidentally, we are happy to learn that in a meeting just last night they decided to recognize the NCAA and sanction some of your events [laughter]—John McKay, from the University of Southern California, the winning Rose Bowl coach.

Representing the United States Track Coaches Association, President James S. Bush of UCLA. [Applause]

We also have two very special guests. From the National Federation of State High School Associations, the executive secretary, Clifford B. Fagin; and the executive director of the National Junior College Athletic Association, George E. Killian. [Applause]

Now a couple of the people up here at the head table. The Secretary-Treasurer of the NCAA, professor of physical education at the District of Columbia Teachers College, a very fine example of that which he teaches, Dr. Samuel E. Barnes. [Applause]

And a fellow we regard as a transplanted Chicagoan, because he has some very good roots here and a lot of good friends, Executive Director of the NCAA, our old friend, Walter Byers. [Applause]

As long as we have you loosened up now, we would like to call upon Secretary Barnes to make a special presentation.

Secretary Barnes: Thank you, Mr. Brickhouse. It is my pleasure at this time to present a special award to a man who has made unique contributions to intercollegiate athletics over a period of nearly four decades. Homer F. Cooke Jr. has been a member of the NCAA staff since 1959. But long before that, he was responsible for innovations in college athletics with which virtually every fan is now familiar. In 1936, Homer Cooke registered his "American Football Statistics Bureau," later to become the National Collegiate Athletic Bureau and now National Collegiate Sports Services. He compiled the first national statistics rankings in college football at the end of that season. In 1938, he began the first weekly national statistics rankings. In those early

years he financed this project himself, with no subsidies of any kind. The rankings were accepted by the Associated Press in 1939 and by the NCAA in 1942. In 1943 Homer extended the program to include college basketball statistics. In 1949, the NCAA contracted with Homer Cooke to publish and distribute its annual Guides and Rules Books. Ten years later, Homer conferred full ownership of his 23-year-old operation to the NCAA. And in 1966, the operation was reorganized with the Statistics Bureau remaining in New York City and with Homer moving to Phoenix to direct the publishing operation.

It is my great pleasure to present this award to the man who invented national statistics rankings in college athletics and nurtured them to acceptance, the man who devised the press box working and reporting forms commonly used today, the man who originated such standard terms in our sports vocabulary as "total offense" and "total defense" and the man who has been responsible for 23 years for the publication of the NCAA's Guides and Rules Books without a dollar of financial loss.

Homer, when you retire in April, you will leave a tremendous legacy for the NCAA and for all of us connected with intercollegiate athletics. We extend our most sincere appreciation and our best wishes.

[The award was presented to Homer Cooke.] [Applause]

Homer Cooke: I am grateful for this most unexpected honor, which I learned about just last night. Even so, had I known about it in advance, I doubt if I could have found words adequate to express my appreciation. Certainly I appreciate that glowing description of my activities, and all of you who have made this moment possible for me. Thank you. [Applause]

Toastmaster Brickhouse: Each year the NCAA awards 80 student-athletes with postgraduate scholarships, and the postgraduate scholarships are one phase of the NCAA's three-phase honors program. The names of the 80 postgraduate scholarship winners for 1972 are listed in your program. For our guests today we have three previous postgraduate scholarship winners at our luncheon today.

It is appropriate that they will be introduced by the man who was the NCAA President when the postgraduate program was started in 1964. May I at this time present the Dean of Extension and University Services of the University of Iowa, Dean Robert F. Ray. [Applause]

Robert F. Ray (University of Iowa): Mr. Brickhouse, Mr. President, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen: I am pleased to report to you today that the postgraduate scholarship program of the NCAA has now awarded \$577,000 to 577 student-athletes since the program's inception in 1964.

Through this program, we in the National Collegiate Athletic Association express our belief that the values of participation in intercollegiate athletics will be reflected in the future lives of these young men. The Association is proud indeed to invest in the advanced education of these gifted men who had the self-discipline and other qualities necessary to earn a varsity letter while demonstrating academic excellence.

Certainly none of us can predict the future of these men; but we believe each has the leadership ability to achieve in his respective field in the world of work, as surely as he has achieved on the playing field and in the classroom.

When the postgraduate scholarship program first began, 32 \$1000 awards were made; but fortunately the NCAA has been able to increase the number to 80 each year.

There has never been a shortage of qualified applicants. The competition has been keen.

We have asked three previous winners of postgraduate scholarships to return today as we honor, through them, not only the 80 winners for 1972 but all of the 577 scholar-athletes they have the honor to represent. Will you please rise when I call your name and remain standing until I conclude your introductions?

First, Frank O. O. Apantaku. Mr. Apantaku graduated in 1971 from Colby College, where he was the mainstay intercollegiate singles and doubles tennis champion in 1969, 1970 and 1971. He was also the state men's singles and doubles champion for 1968, 1969, 1970 and 1971. He was captain of the Colby tennis team for two years.

He also was all-conference in soccer and was a standout competitor in the 400 and long jump in track and field.

Mr. Apantaku had a grade point average of 3.39 as a chemistry and biology major and won a 1971 postgraduate scholarship. He was the graduation class speaker. He planned to become a doctor and currently is in his second year at the Northwestern University Medical School. [Applause]

Next, I should like to present Dr. Thomas W. Lawhorne Jr. Dr. Lawhorne received a postgraduate scholarship in 1967. Not only did he receive a perfect 4.0 grade point average as a chemistry major; he was an outstanding linebacker for the University of Georgia football team. He was a starter for three years and won all Southeastern Conference honors. He was a National Football Foundation Hall of Fame scholar-athlete recipient and won many academic awards.

Dr. Lawhorne was president of his junior and senior classes and served as valedictorian in the 1968 graduating class at the University of Georgia.

He received a medical scholarship at Oxford in 1970. He was graduated from medical school Alpha Omega Alpha. Dr. Lawhorne is in his first year of internship in surgery at Johns Hopkins. He plans to pursue a career in general surgery. [Applause]

Next, I should like to present to you, 1st Lt. Robert S. Parker Jr. Lt. Parker earned his postgraduate scholarship in 1970 when he attended the United States Air Force Academy. He had a 3.76 grade point average as an engineering mechanics major at the Academy. As quarterback to the Falcons, he was second in the nation in passing with 18.1 completions per game in 1970. He still holds most of the Academy's passing and total offense records.

He was named to several All-America teams and was selected as the National Football Foundation's Hall of Fame scholar-athlete.

Lt. Parker currently is assistant technical engineer in the Program Systems Office at the Missile Systems Base in Los Angeles.

With the help of the NCAA postgraduate scholarship he received his Master of Science degree in astrodynamics at the University of California, Los Angeles. [Applause]

Gentlemen, we extend our congratulations to you and to the 577 scholar-athletes you represent here today. Your presence here is gratifying. Your unfolding careers and continuing success are illustrative of what is happening in the lives of those you represent here today.

Your achievement reflects great credit upon yourselves and upon the National Collegiate Athletic Association and all the high ideals this Association exists to advance and make real in American life. We wish you well in your future endeavors. [Applause]

Dr. Lawhorne will now respond for the postgraduate scholars.

Dr. Thomas W. Lawhorne Jr.: Thank you, Dean Ray. On behalf of the 577 recipients of the NCAA postgraduate scholarships, I thank the NCAA for providing us with more than a half million dollars to pursue our various educational goals that have spanned the entire gamut.

Thank you, too, for your interest in academic excellence. The vast majority of men who participate in college athletics do not enter into the professional athletic arena but rather after graduating, pursue architecture, zoology, medicine, law, pharmacy. Their undergraduate degrees are their letters of introduction to a society that is very education-conscious. Your recognition of academic performance as reflected in your scholarships is an indication of your concern for college athletes, and we thank you.

The voice against big college athletics grows louder and louder in some circles with too much emphasis on the dollar mark and on recruiting. This challenges us to rededicate ourselves to the goals we all love, reaffirming our priorities, first to provide quality education and to offer young people the opportunity to compete in big-time contests untainted by any unethical element.

College athletics, as reflected by college football, is more than the tusslings among two dozen boys on Saturday afternoons. It is pageantry and music and fanfare. It is wholesome entertainment throughout the country. It is for the glory of those parents in the grandstand and that coach back home. For those fortunate enough to participate, it is a warm human story of hard work, close friendships and discipline.

This college football embodies more than a knowledge of strategy and the mastery of technique. It is getting knocked down and getting back up. It is reaching back for that something extra. It is being tolerant and yet straining to win the race. It is making a good play and being helped out by 17 men. This is college football.

This is college itself, and these are the sorts of things that make boys men and make them better architects, better zoologists, better fathers, better citizens, better people.

A few days before Christmas, I learned my wife was pregnant with our first child. I don't know what the future holds for us. If we do have a son, I cannot insist he play football or even be an athlete. I can insist that he be and give his best. This I do know. Athletics is a way in which he can develop his every potential.

These remarks today are not intended as a rebuttal to the anti-athletics sentiment but as a personal testimony. They are intended to express my heartfelt appreciation to you for your concern for the lives of young men, as I told a similar audience a couple of years ago.

Gentlemen, thank you for teaching us a lot about life and for giving us a better start. [Applause]

Toastmaster Brickhouse: Thank you, Doctor.

The second part of the NCAA Honors Program is the College Athletics Top Ten. Coming from Chicago, I have to make a note that we talk about the Top Ten not the Big Ten because this year the two are not at all synonymous. [Laughter]

Today's presentation will be the inauguration of this phase of the

Honors Program. College Athletics Top Ten is divided into Today's Top Five and the Silver Anniversary Top Five. The Top Ten not only gives the Association the opportunity to honor the Top Five outstanding senior athletes of the preceding calendar year but also of recognizing five distinguished former student-athletes on their silver anniversary as college graduates.

Each NCAA institution is asked to nominate its top senior student-athlete and the former athletic standout for these associated honors. So it is particularly a great tribute for the men to be honored today when you consider the impressive list of outstanding candidates nominated for the award.

The specific selection criteria for these awards are listed in the brochure, but it is a combination of athletic and academic achievement and distinguished service.

The NCAA is honored by the presence of the first College Athletics Top Ten and salutes them for their achievements and their contribution.

We are going to meet these honorees, starting with Today's Top Five.

Gentlemen, will you please rise and remain standing at your places when I call your names? Following the brief resume of your collegiate career, will you please come to the podium to receive your award from Secretary-Treasurer Barnes.

Robert Wesley Ash, Cornell College, Mt. Vernon, Iowa, football and tennis. The institution's representative is Jerry Klein, head football coach.

Robert Ash has been a three-year starter for the Cornell College football team. This season he was selected as quarterback on the first team, All-Midwest Conference. He also is a two-year letterman in tennis, and he played basketball at Cornell.

Robert has carried a perfect 4.0 grade point average throughout his career and is a history major. He is a Phi Beta Kappa and was nominated for a Rhodes Scholarship. He is senior class president at Cornell, president of the College Choir and president of the Religious Life Council.

He spent last summer in Germany on the Youth Exchange Program and is a member of the Commission for the Future of Cornell College. He is also active on other councils of the institution. Robert was chosen outstanding freshman, I believe, in 1970, and outstanding sophomore man in 1971. He has been the recipient of special scholarship awards in history and social science, and was recently awarded the NCAA postgraduate scholarship. [Applause]

Bruce Patrick Bannon, Pennsylvania State University, football. His institutional representative is Edward M. Czeka, director of athletics.

Bruce Bannon, Penn State All-America defensive end, has been the stalwart of the Nittany Lions' defense for three seasons. At the same time, he has compiled a 3.91 grade point average while majoring in geological science.

Besides the football ability, he won the institution's President's Award in both his freshman and junior years, and has been a Dean's List student for ten consecutive terms. He is a member of three honorary fraternities and was the outstanding defensive player in the 1972 Cotton Bowl game against Texas.

He received a \$500 scholar-athlete award from the National Foot-

ball Foundation's Hall of Fame and \$1,000 NCAA postgraduate scholarship.

Bruce has been a first-team selection on seven All-America teams and was named the nation's outstanding collegiate defensive player by the Washington Pigskin Club. [Applause]

Blake Lynn Ferguson, Drexel University, Philadelphia, football and lacrosse. His institutional representative is John Semanik, director of athletics.

Lynn Ferguson was an academic All-America for Drexel as a defensive back and three-year letterman with a 3.61 grade point average. He received his degree in metallurgical engineering.

He was also an All-America in lacrosse and was named the outstanding senior athlete at Drexel by the Alumni Varsity Group. He was captain of the lacrosse team for two years and of the football team one year. He started every varsity game for three years at Drexel, handled punts, points after touchdowns, field goals and kickoffs. He also returned punts and kickoffs.

He was just as active in lacrosse. He was the leading midfield scorer for two years and was a face-off specialist who was rarely defeated.

He was awarded the NCAA postgraduate scholarship and was active in national honorary societies and student councils at Drexel. [Applause]

Jerry Alan Heidenreich, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas. His institutional representative, Jim Brown, assistant athletic director.

Jerry Heidenreich is the most prolific swimmer to come out of the state of Texas. He was a four-time All-America for the Mustangs and was the high-point man of the Southwest Conference for three seasons. He holds the NCAA record in the 200-yard freestyle and won two gold medals at the 1972 Olympiad in Munich as well as a silver and a bronze.

The gold medals came in the 400-meter free-style and the 400-meter medley relay for the United States team establishing world records.

Jerry won the silver medal in the 100-meter freestyle and the bronze medal in the 100-meter butterfly. He also competed in the 1971 Pan American games and the World University Games.

Jerry had the distinction of having the City of Dallas proclaim October 18, 1972, as Jerry Heidenreich Day. He compiled a 3.1 grade point average as business administration major. [Applause]

Sidney Allen Sink, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, Ohio, track and cross country. His institutional representative is Richard Young, director of athletics.

Sid Sink, Bowling Green's nine-time All-America track and cross country performer, was graduated last June with a degree in mathematics and a 3.08 grade point average.

Sid is a three-time cross country and six-time track All-America at Bowling Green. He established the America and collegiate record in the steeplechase in 1971, and was the NCAA indoor two-mile champion in 1972 and two-time champion of the steeplechase in 1970 and 1971.

He was an active student leader in the campus Union Activities Office and was president of the Varsity Club. He worked with physically

and mentally handicapped children.

Sid was the winner of a \$1000 postgraduate scholarship from the NCAA, and he currently is enrolled as a graduate student in physical education at Bowling Green. [Applause]

Ray R. Evans, Bank president, Kansas City, Missouri, University of Kansas, football and basketball. His institutional representative is Wade R. Stinson, director of athletics.

Ray R. Evans not only was the first All-America football player at Kansas but also won All-America honors in basketball in a career that was sandwiched around three years of Air Force duty during World War II.

Under coach F. C. (Phog) Allen, he was a two-time basketball All-America in 1942 and 1943 as a guard. After entering the service, he returned to Kansas and was a football All-America quarterback in 1947.

He was graduated from the University of Kansas School of Business in 1948; and in 1951, he became associated with the Traders National Bank of which he is now president.

He has been elected to the Helms Foundation Basketball Hall of Fame and the National Football Foundation Hall of Fame. He has served as president and a member of the board of directors of the University of Kansas Alumni Association and as president of the Board of Regents. He is a prominent civic and sports booster in Kansas City.

The first of our Silver Anniversary honorees, Ray R. Evans. [Applause]

John Ferraro, city councilman, Los Angeles, California. University of Southern California, football.

His institutional representative is John Larsen, faculty representative, USC.

John Ferraro was an All-America selection at tackle for USC in 1944 and 1947. He has since distinguished himself as a civic leader in Southern California.

In addition to being All-America two years, John has been named to the USC all-time football team. I don't think we need to say anything more about that as far as football because that covers it all.

He has been a Los Angeles City Councilman since 1966 and served as Los Angeles Police Commissioner from 1953 to 1966. He is also an insurance broker.

He is a member of several key committees on the City Council and is also active in charitable organizations, in Southern California.

He served as an ensign in the Navy during World War II and was presented the Star of Solidarity by the Italian Government. [Applause]

John D. Hopper, Insurance consultant, Camp Hill, Pennsylvania. Dickinson College—baseball, golf and basketball. His institutional representative is David Eavenson, director of athletics.

John D. Hopper was a three-sport star at Dickinson College. He was a four-year varsity letterman in basketball, serving three years as captain, and lettered two years each on the baseball and golf teams. He was named the outstanding athlete at Dickinson in his sophomore, junior and senior years and was elected to Dickinson's Sports Hall of Fame.

He received his LLB degree from the Dickinson School of Law and

became a field life underwriter in 1952. He passed the Pennsylvania Bar examination in 1953 and passed the C.L.U. examination in 1958. His insurance agency led all agencies in the United States in sales three times and placed second twice since 1958. He is active in civic and professional organizations. [Applause]

Donald G. Mulder, Surgeon, Los Angeles, California. Hope College, basketball and baseball. His institutional representative is Gordon Brewer, director of athletics.

Dr. Donald G. Mulder is professor of surgery at the School of Medicine at the UCLA Medical Center. A graduate of Johns Hopkins Medical School, he is recognized as a pioneer in the technique and practice of open heart surgery.

He lettered three years as a guard on the Hope College basketball team and was an All-Conference choice all three seasons. He was also a pitcher and infielder for the baseball team and served the school as Student Council president.

Dr. Mulder was presented the all-campus athletic award as the Athlete of the Year in his senior year at Hope College.

He now resides in Santa Monica, where he spends time in teaching, in research and in the actual practice of surgery. He participates in medical forums throughout the nation and has written numerous articles for professional journals.

In 1971 Hope College presented Dr. Mulder with the institution's Distinguished Alumnus Award. [Applause]

Stewart L. Udall, Lawyer, Washington, D. C., University of Arizona, basketball. His institutional representative is David Strack, director of athletics.

Stewart L. Udall won three letters in basketball for the University of Arizona, where he received his LLB degree. In addition to his law practice in Washington, he is a visiting professor at Yale University.

Following graduation at Arizona, he entered law practice. He was elected to the Arizona State Legislature in 1958 and was then appointed Secretary of the Interior by President John F. Kennedy and served in the Lyndon B. Johnson administration.

In 1971 he was a special environmental consultant to the State of Pennsylvania. Besides his great interest in environment, he is a life-long advocate of physical fitness. [Applause]

To respond on behalf of Today's Top Five honorees will be Bruce Bannon.

Bruce Bannon: Members of the NCAA, guests and fellow honorees: First, I would like to thank the NCAA for this tremendous and important honor that they have bestowed upon myself and my fellow collegians today.

I don't believe that a person who is going to a college or a university should have the idea that he will improve upon one facet of his person. That is, a person shouldn't go to a college just to participate in sports; and in turn, a person shouldn't go just to study and to increase his knowledge. Of course, it is great when a man has superior power in the athletic field or superior power in the classroom or excels in music or the performing arts; but the thing I believe is important is that college should be an experience that helps to build a well-rounded person with a diversity of interests. I believe that both the college and the person fail if when that person graduates, he may be labeled by such terms as "jock," a person whose entire world lies

upon the athletic field, or who may be called an "egghead," who has no interests outside of his studies and his academic pursuits.

In this way I feel that this award presented today is important because the honorees are selected not just as athletes, not just as students, but as scholar-athletes who have grown in many ways through the experience of college.

So in thanking the NCAA for this great honor, I would also like to commend you, the members of the NCAA, for realizing the importance of educating both the body and the mind through the college experience. [Applause]

Toastmaster Brickhouse: Stewart Udall is going to respond on behalf of the Silver Anniversary Top Five. Of course, he is a pretty well-known Democrat, but he told us that in the wake of the recent developments he is going to listen to any reasonable offer. [Laughter]

Stewart L. Udall: I do have a comment that is interesting. Of the five of us—I am sorry, John Ferraro, a fellow Democrat—four of us were basketball players—and I don't know about you, Ray—and are all about six feet or under, a sort of commentary on an early era I guess. [Laughter]

I can say, briefly, I rarely read a speech; but this honor set my mind back and caused me to reflect on a lot of things, and I want to say something rather serious to you because I know that the issue of reform is before this convention. I don't know all that much about it; but I tend to think that for my way of thinking the more the NCAA hews to true amateurism, the more you keep the system honest and better. So let me read this and be brief about it.

Looking back, it was my good fortune to be an undergraduate before the arrival of high-pressure athletic programs. By present standards, it was an era of innocence, of true amateurism. As I remember it, recruiting was distinctly low-key (and mostly in-state), the squads and coaching staffs were small—and many of us who were unrecruited and unscholarshipped could go out for the "team" and make it. In fact, 30 years ago the teams of most state universities and colleges were authentic in the sense that a substantial majority of the players were "local boys" who were products of the high schools of those states.

To be candid, there are many things about intercollegiate athletics in this country that distress me these days. For one thing, I deplore a greedy, weighted system that obviously promotes dynasties. Is it a good thing, year after year, for the same topdog teams to go to the bowl games? Is it healthy for a few favored teams to dominate their conferences because of advantages as incurred by a well-heeled alumni or undeserved prestige?

I am even more appalled at the win-or-perish approach to coaching. One of the saddest news stories I have read in recent weeks was the human fallout after the sacking of another football coach at the University of Kentucky—a man I never met but who obviously, from all I read, meant a lot to his players.

The extent to which anything-to-win attitudes have corrupted some schools was revealed two weeks ago at Miami when the new Nebraska football coach spoke out against the reforms that are being voted upon here—reforms that might equalize competition a bit and reduce the pressure-cooker tempo of recruiting. His comment was that any changes would only "lead to more cheating" — more cheating. Tom Osborne, I suppose, was merely expressing the old "we're No. 1 and

we want to keep our competitors down" philosophy when he said:

We're competing with pro football. We have a fine program, and TV and bowl games are interested in us. The savings effected by reducing the number of coaches and scholarships won't offset the loss of prestige and TV receipts.

Is that what it boils down to these days? If indeed you're "competing with the pros," why not strip away all pretense and openly do as the pros do?

I may be old-fashioned, but I believe something important is being lost in this mad stampede toward the professionalization of college athletics.

I am quite certain that in the past, men like Adolph Rupp and Woody Hayes would have been leading intercollegiate athletics in the wrong direction.

In the past, your programs played an important role in our national life. They should continue to do so. They encouraged physical vigor. They inculcated a sense of fair play. And, above all, they taught the country the great lesson that all men—in games as well as in the game of life—are and must be treated as equals on the playing field or off. Are we running the risk of throwing away some of these values as college athletics becomes more and more commercialized? This is a serious question all of you must ponder.

Athletic competition had a strong influence on my life. Yet when I recall the years of my youth, it is not the scores of the games or the championships won I remember the most. My coaches, it gives me pride to recall, were simple, straightforward, character-building men—men who taught me more about life than about sports.

There were three main lessons I learned from college athletics. There was the lesson of the importance of team play, team spirit and personal friendships. There was the lesson that racist attitudes toward other human beings were not only unsportsmanlike but a contradiction of the very spirit of this country. And finally—shall I utter the heresy?—I am quite certain that the most vital gift I took away from experiences in college athletics was the lesson of learning how to lose with a semblance of grace.

Winning, being No. 1, dominating other teams, persons or countries has become in recent years, I fear, a sort of new national disease. And in our shallow worship of the winning-is-everything cult, I fear we have lost sight of the fact that at one time or another in our lives all of us are losers. Much of the human predicament is not pleasant; and in the larger game of life, there are far more losers, more individuals who have to settle for being No. 2 or No. 3 or No. 4, or have to play second-string or second-fiddle to someone else, than there are winners. Winners are often insufferable and need no creed to sustain them. However, it takes real character and courage to cope with failure and frustration; and the personal loss is immeasurable when an individual cannot conquer defeat, despair or humiliation.

So I want to strike a blow today for reforms and those reformers who still believe in some of the old values of trying, as I said, to equalize the opportunities and keep the system close to the principles of this organization. I am glad there are still some colleges where football is fun and the alumni are easy-going, and coaches are not uptight. I am glad there are some schools that still recruit in the lazy, low-key way

of yesteryear and put as much emphasis on intramural competition as on the "big teams."

I say, let the pros have their monomaniac coaches and greedy superstars. After all, professional sports are a business, and money is the name of the game. But I want to express the hope that the institutions that subscribe to the NCAA principles will play the game according to those principles and give some thought to the science of life—to the "science" of learning to lose well and learning to win with classic Olympian grace. [Applause]

Toastmaster Brickhouse: Thank you, Mr. Udall.

It is always fun to hear from successful people and be in the company of successful people, as we are today. I am reminded of the story of the guy who became executive vice-president of a giant corporation. His friend, Joe, said, "Two years ago you were shop foreman, and now you are vice-president of the whole thing. What happened?"

He said, "I don't know, Joe, but ever since that guy with the golf spikes stepped on my IBM card I have been going great around here." [Laughter]

Now I would like to call upon the very capable President of the NCAA, Dr. Earl Ramer of the University of Tennessee, to present the Association's highest honor, the Theodore Roosevelt Award. [Applause]

President Ramer: Thank you, Mr. Brickhouse. The Theodore Roosevelt Award is the highest honor awarded by our Association. We are delighted to present the 1973 award to a distinguished American, General of the Army Omar N. Bradley. We regret the General's health does not permit him to be with us today, but we are most fortunate that Lt. General William A. Knowlton will accept the award on the General's behalf. General Knowlton is the distinguished superintendent of the United States Military Academy. He also is a close friend of General Bradley, and it was the General's personal request that he accept the award for him.

The Theodore Roosevelt Award is given to a prominent American whose competitive athletics in college and attention to well being thereafter have been an important factor in a distinguished career of national significance and achievement. The previous recipients of this award were President Dwight D. Eisenhower, Senator Leverett Saltonstall, Supreme Court Justice Byron R. White, former college president Frederick L. Hovde, Christopher C. Kraft, Jr., deputy director of the Aeronautics and Space Administration, and most recently Dr. Jerome Holland, former United States Ambassador to Sweden.

It is impossible to give a brief summary of General Bradley's career, but I will attempt to give you the highlights.

It started in 1893 with General Bradley. It was on February 12 of that year when General Bradley was born in Clark, Missouri, a thriving community with fewer than 300 inhabitants in the central part of the "Show-Me State."

He was appointed to the United States Military Academy from the Second District of Missouri in 1911. As a cadet in the United States Military Academy at West Point, General Bradley played center on the Army football team for two years and was a member of the Army's first undefeated team in 1914.

He lettered four seasons on the Army baseball team as an outfielder where he posted a .383 batting average. He also participated in indoor track.

He graduated with high achievement in the class of 1915. He became the first in his class to achieve the rank of General, which he did in 1945, and of course was to become a General of the Army in 1950.

During World War II he commanded, first a division, then a corps, an army, and finally a group of armies. His last command was the 12th United States Army group in Europe with more than 1,300,000 combat troops, which was the largest body of American soldiers ever to serve under one field commander.

Three weeks after VE-Day, General Bradley became head of the Veterans Administration during the postwar mobilization of the armed forces.

In February of 1948, he became Chief of Staff of the Army and a year and a half later, was appointed chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the highest military office presently attainable by any officer in the armed services. He was reappointed to that post in 1951 and served until 1953.

Among the many honors he has received are the Distinguished Service Medal with Three Oak Leaf Clusters, the Silver Star, the Distinguished Service Medal of the United States Navy, the Legion of Merit with Oak Leaf Cluster, and the Bronze Star Medal.

He has been awarded many honorary degrees and has been decorated by many foreign countries.

We hope General Bradley will be as proud of this award as we are in presenting it to him.

General Knowlton, will you please come to the podium to receive the 1973 Theodore Roosevelt Award in behalf of General of the Army, Omar N. Bradley? [Applause]

General William A. Knowlton: Thank you, Dr. Ramer. Before I respond, I would like to say I am not the only representative of General Bradley here today. Some of you may not know that he is the only living General of the Army, and the Generals of the Army are always on active duty.

Beside me at the podium is his senior aide, Colonel Warren Schilling. I will ask that he please stand. [Applause.]

Ladies and gentlemen, it is with a great deal of pride and humility that I stand before you today to accept the honor of the Theodore Roosevelt Award on behalf of and in place of General of the Army Omar N. Bradley. I feel particularly honored that General Bradley would authorize me to act in his place here today. Our personal association goes back for a quarter of a century, and it pains me to realize that I am one of the few still remaining on active duty who had an opportunity to work closely with this very great American.

I do have, however, two messages which I would like to share with you today. General Bradley is not with you only because the doctor would not permit him to travel. And so, the first message is a message from General Bradley explaining in brief why he cannot be here. Let me read you part of that message.

I accepted this award because I wanted to be with you to salute the National Collegiate Athletic Association for its vital and sizeable contribution toward our way of life.

I truly am sorry I cannot be with you today, but my doctor and my wife forbid my traveling at this time—and that is a parlay I simply cannot beat.

[Laughter]

Of even more significance to you today would be the remarks he would have made if he had been present. Fortunately, I was able to obtain a copy of that second set of comments. These thoughts, also, I would like to share with you at this time.

I accept this award very aware that my name is being coupled with that of Theodore Roosevelt after whom this award is named. Through its history, our nation has been privileged to have men of just such stature who have struck fire to an idea and fueled the flame that ultimately led to productive organizations like the National Collegiate Athletic Association which we honor here today.

It has always seemed to me a good idea to take care of the only body God has given me in which to live out this life. One of the earliest controlled experiments of sound health practices is recorded by the Bible in the first chapter of Daniel while Daniel was a captive in a pagan Babylonian king's court. In like manner we must encourage our youth today to turn from the health-destroying devices crowding in on them from the various sub-cultures they daily encounter.

The vigorous mental and physical discipline of competitive sports is one of the surest roads I know to ultimate physical fitness. Our youth must be taught to compete, to excel and to be better prepared than the opponent. If we as a nation are to continue to enjoy the freedoms we long have cherished, we must maintain will, courage and moral and physical strength to protect them. Physical fitness is a weapon that has just as sharp an edge as any of the sophisticated hardware we have in our country's arsenal.

At West Point I participated on varsity teams that instilled the competitive spirit and the will to win into the players. Many players were to serve with me later in battle. Just last week while we were preparing a shipment to the Omar N. Bradley Museum, my staff and I reviewed some photographs of my former teammates. Of those who remained in service through World War II, I noted that every member of our baseball team and all save two members of the football team achieved General Officer rank. It is my belief that the encounters we had on the playing field helped to prepare us for the encounters we had with our enemy.

Democracy is like a stand of tall timber. It must be cultivated by toil and nourished by the sweat of those who would keep it. Ladies and gentlemen, we must employ our disciplined physical strength boldly and righteously because we owe it to our country and to the millions of veterans, living and dead, who have fought and still are fighting for our American heritage.

I am confident that every one of them joins me as I salute you for your contribution toward our way of life.

You have all heard a brief summary of the service which General of the Army Bradley has rendered to the United States. You have heard a little of his accomplishments in baseball and football while at the Military Academy. The football team on which he played was the first undefeated football team in Army history. The baseball team

achieved an 18-3 record during the 1915 season. The general continued his baseball career by playing on the team of the 14th Infantry. I have a picture of him before the invasion, where he warmed up with his staff by playing baseball.

There is one interesting story from 1914 because this was a period when football players wore no numbers—to the confusion of all but the most dedicated fans. From this confusion came an interesting result.

After two years as an apprentice player, Bradley lined up as third string varsity center. His chances for playing against Navy looked dim. John J. McEwan, the giant from Minnesota and a member of Football's Hall of Fame, had a solid grip on the position. The second string center was the capable and jovial "Snoops" Goodman. Just before the Navy game Goodman ran afoul of our regulations and was benched by the Commandant of Cadets. Early in the Navy game, McEwan received a head injury, and Bradley substituted twice for him. His passes from center were perfect. As linebacker on defense, he made tackle after tackle. When dusk fell on Franklin Field, the score was Army 20, Navy 0.

In the crowd watching the game was Walter Camp. On the lookout for top-flight players, he selected McEwan as first string center on the All-America team. For years the Minnesota giant used to say, "Walter Camp thought I was Omar Bradley. Bradley made me All-America." [Laughter]

But in these days of a permissive society it is well to look at one facet of Omar Bradley's childhood. I am talking partly of the normal chores of filling the woodbox, keeping the buckets filled with water, helping with the milking of the cows and feeding and caring for 200 chickens. But even more important was the summer that he unloaded 40-ton railroad cars on the Wabash Railroad, shoveling coal for ten hours a day, six days a week, at 13 cents an hour. You might try that wage on your children or grandchildren. The next summer he worked in the boiler shop for the princely sum of 17 cents an hour. It is absolutely certain that his powerful throwing arm was developed by swinging a shovel in the railroad car and swinging the sledge hammer in the boiler shop. The benefit to his character is also certain.

But enough of sporting reminiscences. I am proud to have been permitted to stand here today and receive this award on behalf of one of the giants of all time—General of the Army Omar Bradley. [Applause]

President Ramer: It is our Association's custom to present a plaque to the institution from which the Theodore Roosevelt Award winner graduated. I would like once again to call General Knowlton to the podium to accept the institutional award. [Applause]

General Knowlton: I hate to tell you this, but I have to speak again for a minute. You have already suffered through a longer time than I should have presumed upon. There are, however, two things I would like to share in accepting this honor for the institution.

The military academy at West Point is an institution of which all of us are very proud. We all wish that the ultimate task for which we prepare, leadership in combat, were not a necessary part of our civilization, and of man's record of inhumanity to man. But as long as the history of man continues to reflect this basic human trait—and as long as the rule of law is valid only when there are sanctions for those

who do not obey the law—then there is a need for institutions like the service academies.

In the speech which he wrote for this occasion, General Bradley mentioned the mental and physical discipline of competitive sports. He mentioned that all but two members of the football team achieved the rank of General Officer. Lastly, he mentioned that the encounters on the playing field helped prepare for the more difficult encounters of the battlefield.

It is for that reason that the service academies have such a vigorous program of sports. The qualities demanded by the sports, and particularly by the bodily contact sports, are those which we seek and nurture throughout a cadet's career. The intercollegiate program with which all of you at the NCAA have helped in so many ways is but the tip of the iceberg. Behind the sizeable program of intercollegiate sports lies the extensive intramural program—an intramural program known at West Point by the affectionate name of intramurder. And behind both of those is the required course in physical education where all cadets are exposed to the rigors of athletic competition with and against their fellows.

General Bradley represents the finest of what we hope the institution will produce. While not all of our graduates will be Omar Bradleys, we accept with great pride this award testifying to this particular case where institution and individual combined to equal success. [Applause]

Toastmaster Brickhouse: Thank you, General. You mentioned the expression, running afoul of regulations, an expression, of course, which will be completely foreign to anybody sitting out here. But this is a true story.

In 1964 I was covering the Republican Convention in San Francisco, and I got an interview with President Eisenhower. I had read this somewhere, so I had a chance finally to ask him about it.

I said, "Mr. Eisenhower, Mr. President, I once read a story that said if you will pick up the box scores of the Kansas State League you will see a fellow playing professional ball in right field with the very unimaginative name of D. Brown, and that D. Brown was really D. Eisenhower playing professional ball on the side under another name."

He asked, "Where did you get that?" [Laughter]

I asked, "Is it true?"

He said, "Yes, but I didn't know anybody knew it."

Of course, you understand that was long before the NCAA became as strong as it is now. [Laughter]

Actually, he said for three or four weeks, he and three or four other fellows on the college football team had played with the professionals that summer.

Moose Krause—you may have seen Moose Krause up here talking to me before we started—we have a tie-in; and of course this is a true story.

Ziggie Zeroski, the very colorful ex-football player at Notre Dame, and Moose Krause were at the Waldorf Astoria a year ago for the Football Foundation Hall of Fame dinner. Ziggie suddenly found himself in the same elevator with General Omar Bradley.

Ziggie said to Omar Bradley, "How do you do, sir? Ziggie Zeroski of Notre Dame and George Connelly of the Chicago Bears."

General Bradley said, "How do you do, gentlemen? Omar Bradley."

Now the elevator started up and they were silent. Ziggie felt the need for some kind of face-saving remark, and he said, "Well, General, I sure have enjoyed all your battles." [Laughter]

As I said, we had a timetable. We are within four minutes of that, and I am proud of that fact up here. We are pleased you chose to spend the last couple of hours with us today. We hope you have enjoyed yourselves. I personally have enjoyed being a part of this program. I wanted to keep something like this not too heavy. You hope you can say something light that will kind of balance it once in a while. I found myself sitting here absolutely enchanted with what I was listening to.

I would like to offer my personal congratulations to each of today's honorees. Each of you is obviously most deserving of the honor and the award you received.

In my business, which is the business of reporting sports, the two most important words are dedication and desire; and the older I get, the more important those words become.

I am standing here right now; and I realize I am part of an organization today, the NCAA, which has demonstrated and is demonstrating those two words so beautifully, setting the example for the young people they are hoping to influence. So speaking on behalf of my profession, thank you very much for the privilege of being associated with you in any way. [Applause]

President Ramer: Thank you, Jack. You may know that this Association is undertaking improvement of its enforcement program. We are no longer confined to the investigation of infractions occurring within the last five years. We are most grateful for this information concerning D. Brown. [Laughter]

We are pleased with Jack Brickhouse today. He has done a wonderful job. [Applause]

Jack, as a token of our appreciation, I would like to present you with a NCAA silver bowl; and we hope it will remind you of this occasion, especially of our sincere appreciation for your coming. [Applause]

Jack Brickhouse: Thank you very much, Dr. Ramer. And, of course I get to maintain my amateur standing. Thank you very much. [Laughter]

President Ramer: I would like to ask the Rev. John E. Biegert to approach the podium at this time to close this year's Honors Luncheon by offering our benediction.

The Rev. John E. Biegert: As we go our various ways, may the inspiration, the challenge, the provocative thoughts of this luncheon be carried away with us and inspire us in the future to be better persons, following more faithfully the way You want us to live.

Dismiss us, O God, with Your blessing and Your benediction. Amen.

BUSINESS SESSION

Friday Afternoon, January 12, 1973

The Convention was called to order at 3:10 p.m. by President Ramer.

President Ramer: It was a real privilege to attend a luncheon gathering this noon which concentrated on the same things that bind us together. The fact is, ladies and gentlemen, I am simply scared to begin this agenda today and tomorrow. We are in the process of achieving or trying to achieve the fundamental transfer of this Association. I was very much impressed, as I know you were, by the statements made by Stewart Udall at the luncheon. I said to myself, here he is, talking about the goals that bind us together, talking about the big principles; and while we have not achieved them all—some of them we have not achieved in my opinion in great measure—we are in a common quest for achievement. That is why we are here, to consider these various proposals and try as best we may on this convention floor, regardless of all of our committee paraphernalia and all our frustrations, to achieve the kind of result that is best for all of us.

[Members of the administrative staff in Kansas City (page 7) were introduced.]

Now, I discovered last night at the reception that we have had two of our fraternal delegates from Canada with us again this year, the same two indeed who were introduced in the convention last year. I expressed embarrassment to them that I had not presented them yesterday. It may be indeed that they have returned. I want to identify them, and if they are present ask them to stand and receive our commendation for their presence.

Robert W. Pugh, Executive Secretary, and Carl Totzke, President, of the Canadian Intercollegiate Athletic Union. Mr. Pugh and Mr. Totzke, if you are present, will you stand? I understood they might have returned to Canada and would not be with us. We are delighted as always to have these visitors.

[The Canadian representatives were not present.]

I would like also to introduce at this time a visiting delegate, Miss Laurie Anne Mabrey, representing the Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women. She is a member of the faculty of Illinois State University. Miss Mabrey, will you stand and let us recognize you? We are delighted to see you. [Applause]

You know, when you mention some people, it is almost necessary to get their names in, and I am thinking now of a phrase, "the all-time great." I understand that Doug Wilson is with us this afternoon. For many years he was Secretary-Treasurer of this Association and a distinguished servant of this Association. If Doug Wilson is here, I want him to stand and receive our applause. [Applause] Mr. Wilson, we honor you; and we are delighted you are with us this afternoon.

We will have presented in the morning, at the opening session, an amended report of the Memorial Resolutions Committee. The Chairman of that Committee, Mr. Edwin Horner, reports to us that

we have significant numbers of additions; so a supplementary report before the Convention will be made in the morning, and if some of you have not even yet presented your names to him, let me suggest that you do so over the afternoon or evening.

I would like to announce at this time that our registration at 8 o'clock this morning had broken all records. We have had a registration as of 8 o'clock of 747, not including the press. The previous high had been 738. We have had a total individual vote of 432 institutional representatives and 30 conference representatives, making a total of 462, with the previous total vote, previous high total vote of 436, and a previous high institutional vote alone of 417.

I am quite certain that those numbers may have been exceeded by this time.

Members of the Convention, I would like to remind you that we are moving to that section of our agenda designated for Friday afternoon. I would like to remind you that we are approaching the proposals not merely as a segment of the agenda but as an order of business. There is a sequential order proposed for the agenda. There has been contemplation of moving the order of business numbers of times. We perhaps did that once yesterday; I don't recall.

With the consent of the Convention last year in Hollywood, I remember, we changed the order of the amendments several times—several times merely upon the choice of the Chairman without objection from the floor. We changed the order two or three times upon majority vote, as I recall, of the assembly. I think we are facing a slightly different problem this year. I think there is greater demand this year than I can recall in previous years for changing the order of our business. I think those of us who may not have in mind the proposal of changes in order attach a great deal of seriousness to any change in order, particularly two or three possible changes that have been discussed in the Council and two or three possible changes that have been suggested to me by individuals.

The Chair at this time is about to make a ruling that will prevail unless countermanded in some way by the parliamentarian, namely, that any change in the order of business—the movement of any single proposed amendment to another slot in the sequence—will be accomplished only after a vote of two-thirds majority by this Convention.

12. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Revision of the Agenda

Edward S. Betz (University of Pacific): Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. I would like to propose a change in the agenda. Proposals 75 through 92, dealing with the 1,600 legislation, are of such importance that it seems to me they should come at an earlier point in the convention proceedings. To leave them to the end or near the end of the convention might not give us adequate time to discuss them.

Therefore, I move a change in the agenda to place Items 75 through 92 immediately following Proposal 50 and immediately before Proposal 51.

You have this proposal in writing before you.

President Ramer: Mr. Betz, let me see if I understand the motion now. Proposal 75 isn't really before us this afternoon under the agenda.

Mr. Betz: I don't know when it will come up.

President Ramer: And you would like for the move for this to be known overnight. I can understand. Now the proposal to move 75—and will you repeat the point at which it will be moved, please?

Mr. Betz: Move 75 clear through 92.

President Ramer: Proposals 75 through 92?

Mr. Betz: Yes. They all deal in one way or another with that important item. Move those after Proposal 50. Then 51 would follow 92.

C. D. Henry (Grambling College): Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

President Ramer: Just a minute, Henry. Proposals 75 through 92 to be moved, Mr. Betz, immediately following Item 50 in the agenda?

Mr. Betz: Yes.

President Ramer: I believe you have heard the motion.

Franklin A. Lindeburg (University of California, Riverside): I would like to know under what terms the parliamentarian has the right to raise this to two-thirds majority. It is without precedent. You are asking for two-thirds majority when a simple majority was available in the past.

President Ramer: I would like to respond to that first and then ask Mr. Plant.

Mr. Lindeburg: In the District meeting, District 8, one of the members of the Council met with us. I know he cannot speak for the Council, but he assured us that it would be a majority vote to change any items on the agenda because that had been done in the past.

President Ramer: I assumed it was a majority vote, but we checked the NCAA procedure, and our procedure calls for a two-thirds vote of the assembly in order to change the sequence of business. Mr. Plant and I have conferred on this. What we are doing is deferring at this time, not to the practice last year or not to the practice the year before, but what our own legislation says.

Marc, will you comment on that also, please?

I might add, as Marc is approaching the microphone, that the compelling feeling of need I have in the proposal that we stay with our own regulations is the mounting feeling that we have for and against the changes in the agenda.

Marc, will you comment please?

Mr. Plant: The basis of the Chairman's ruling appears in Regulation 1, Executive Regulations of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, paragraph 2:

The order of business and any procedural rule prescribed by the executive director and officers, or the Executive Committee, for the conduct of the annual business meeting may be changed or suspended by a two-thirds vote of the members present and voting, provided that such change or suspension is not in conflict with any provision of the Constitution or Bylaws.

President Ramer: Thank you, Marc. I would like to say I have some personal preferences on the matter; and very frankly, I would like to see majority rule prevail in making certain shifts I have in mind. What we are doing in this instance, is deferring to our own regulations on the matter.

[The motion was seconded.]

The Chair recognizes Mr. Henry of Grambling.

C. D. Henry (Grambling College): I want to propose another change. Do you plan to complete that first?

President Ramer: I think we should discuss Mr. Betz's motion and vote on it. Now the motion is to take Amendment 75 through Amendment 92 and to place those in the order of convention business immediately following Item 50.

Is there discussion? The question is called for.

Please vote by show of paddles, and I will ask our Elections Committee please to take their places of responsibility.

[The motion was approved 381-41.]

Revision of the Agenda

C. D. Henry (Grambling College): Southwestern Athletic Conference and from District 6. I am rising to propose a change and consider Proposal No. 45 from the Constitution on Financial Aid and Determination of Financial Need, which would be the accompanying Bylaw No. 46, as the first order of business this afternoon.

President Ramer: Thank you, Mr. Henry. This would place these two immediately before No. 15. Mr. Henry, may I raise one question here? I assume you deliberately omit No. 47, which also concerns financial need.

Mr. Henry: It could join the package without any argument. I would want the financial need discussed before reorganization.

President Ramer: With Mr. Henry's permission then, let's include No. 47. This would keep the related motions together because No. 47 indeed is a proposal to amend No. 46. You heard the motion. Is there a second?

[The motion was seconded.]

Jack Edmondson (West Texas State University): This was brought up in District 6, and the purpose for this is to get the reorganization of the NCAA passed. Until the basis of need is solved many College Division teams will not vote for reorganization. That was the purpose of getting the basis of need settled first. I thought somebody might like to know that.

President Ramer: Thank you, sir. Further discussion? The Chair is calling now for the vote on this. Once again, a show of paddles.

[The motion was defeated 120-281.]

Membership Division

President Ramer: We move now to several proposals, 15 and 16 especially. Many of you have labeled them enabling legislation. They are, nevertheless, constitutional changes and, therefore, need two-thirds majority for approval.

Item No. 15. The Chair recognizes Professor David Swank, University of Oklahoma.

David Swank (University of Oklahoma): Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of Item No. 15.

[The motion was seconded.]

I am going to be very brief because we talked about this yesterday, and we talked about it in our district meetings this morning. There is one thing I would like for you to consider when you are voting on this. Remember this is reorganization. We will be voting on the need and the limitations later on by constitutional amendment also. So don't try to lump all of these together, as we did yesterday. We tried to separate them. I would urge your adoption of this amendment.

Ross H. Smith (Massachusetts Institute of Technology): I would like to speak briefly, as president of the Eastern College Athletic Conference, to a position taken by a sizeable majority of our membership—somewhat in excess of 200 institutions—with specific reference to this Proposal No. 15.

At the outset, I would like to make it very clear that my remarks are not intended to discredit the leadership of our Association or the Council for the tremendous efforts that have gone into what is before us.

First, I would like to make it very clear that we subscribe to the goals of reorganization and to the need for a plan to achieve these goals. Indeed, over a period of several years we have successfully experienced a reorganization of our own legislation in our own competitive structures to provide for self-determination as we hope to have it here to accommodate the interests of the several groups within our conference. We are a heterogeneous group—large, small, state, public institutions. I say, it took us several years. I might say the implementation was preceded by three years of Quo Vadis study prior to the actual implementation of our concept.

Admittedly, the mechanics were simpler, a lot simpler, at the level of a regional conference of 200 members than are the problems we have discussed here for a national conference of 700 members.

However, to get to the issues quickly, I want to speak to two specific objections with the reorganization plan presented to this convention. We have heard other objections the past couple of days; but in the interest of brevity, I am limiting my remarks to just two points.

No. 1. The NCAA membership has been and is this day aiming to reorganize through self-determination. We went home from Hollywood with this as a goal. At least we want self-determination to a degree that we have at present. We now enjoy designating our UD and our CD classification.

In spite of the tremendous efforts Dave Swank and his committee have made—we do recognize this—we simply do not believe that the plan presented at this Convention achieves this goal of self-determination, except—and I pay respect to this—for the limited relief from the “fish or fowl” rule in two sports.

Beyond our conference, we have heard from a variety of institutions across this nation to whom this plan is not acceptable. Included in this is a cross-section of large, medium and small-scale programs, nevertheless a very sizeable portion of the NCAA membership.

Objection No. 2. We do not believe that we can separate the mechanics of reorganization from the goals which reorganization is expected to achieve. Some of the proposals that were just made are evidence of that.

We believe it is essential to look ahead to the next steps which include legislation to implement the plan before we vote the power. Why should we legislate the power to reorganize the plan. We do not distrust, but we don't think we should nor should this Convention legislate the power before we know the details of the plan. The ability to give the power will always be there when an acceptable plan is available.

In summary, this plan does not in our opinion provide an acceptable process whereby the entire membership of the NCAA can achieve its

respective goals. Neither, unfortunately, can we presume does the subsequent amendment we heard of yesterday, which will be enacted or acted on during the remaining sessions. We don't think we can wait for those amendments or assume they are going to be passed to insure what we feel is the achievement of the goals that we must vote on now in voting for Proposal No. 15.

Finally, so that our position not be construed as destructive, we would like this Convention to know if No. 15 fails, the NCAA Council will have the opportunity to designate a method whereby grassroots interests of the entire membership will be able to participate in the design of a reorganization plan with ample time for drafts for testing, for testing and retesting, if necessary, prior to final presentation at the 1974 Convention. This is mainly to avoid the frustrations that we have gone through here for four or five days.

We sincerely hope these remarks will be constructive to the Council, constructive to the membership and in the best interest of the many institutions that are represented here today.

Peter A. Carlesimo (Fordham University): The proposed reorganization places Fordham in Division II, simply because it sponsors varsity football on a College Division basis. Despite the fact that one of our objectives is to increase our classification, this is what happens to Fordham University in sports with 100 students actively participating in intramural sports which is a very valuable part of our program.

Now at Fordham University, we sponsor 10 varsity sports. In nine of these sports we compete actively 90 per cent against Division I institutions. Our philosophy is geared this way. We try to be in Division I. In five of our sports, we could conceivably, in any given year, be strong enough to compete on a national basis for NCAA championships; but the regulation which allows us to select a Division II institution to compete on a national basis does not solve any problems. It only creates more of them. There are many other schools in similar circumstances.

We would also like to add that our institution is now competing in football on a club basis, and they are being encouraged to continue in this way. They would become Division II as opposed to Division I.

I do not mean to look down upon Division II when I make these statements. It is merely a philosophy, that we feel we should be in Division I.

C. D. Henry (Grambling College): I rise for the schools in Division II who don't plan to go any place except to Division II. Some people may pass Resolution 15 which might make them pass 16, Divided Voting, and then decide further down the line, on 45 it doesn't make any difference about constitutional change because they would be voting for their own self-determination. If you are in a state like we are, where the state will allow you to sign a number of boys, you may get that one “blue-chipper” on any basis. If we have decided to sign on the basis of need, and those other universities in our state can sign him for a free ride; I think you know where he is going.

We are not against reorganization the way it is given in the first proposal. The way it is now and the legislation that follows, we Division II schools, ask you to defeat this resolution. [Applause]

James Bedell (Adelphi University): I feel I have a right to speak to this.

Contrary to all we have heard in regard to the reorganization and what it is supposed to do to further enhance self-determination, I think this is misleading. In fact I think I can show you that it really does retard the course of self-determination. The very purpose of any reorganization is to allow greater self-determination.

I sat here yesterday; and it was demeaning to me to hear even said in jest by the gentleman from Texas, that he had to make a deal on hockey, so he could get something through. I think it is wrong for an organization to force its schools to take devious means to insure legislation that will benefit them. This reorganization legislation is certainly not going to help it.

It seems to me the very first step in answering this question is to establish a realistic division of interest groups within the NCAA. I don't believe Division I or II, which is little more than a little elaboration of the College and University Divisions, will do it. I think there are more interest groups than that. I don't believe we have reached that point where we can identify them. I don't know where I belong. In the present structure, I don't know where I am going to be.

I think the other point is the people up in Division I who are going to stay there have no concern. The people who are dropping down into Division II, first of all, have their noses out of joint. That is No. 1.

No. 2, the people competing in Division II for the College Division now have to compete against them to get recognition on a national level. The poor guy who is left with nowhere to go is the guy who has been in College Division. He never really had much chance to obtain championship in that Division and now is completely forgotten, and no one cares about him. In the present structure of reorganization there is no allowance for him. Everyone seems to be unhappy with it.

Why does the Council try to pass this package on to us? I don't understand. I sat here yesterday and asked a question. I didn't feel I got an honest answer. If the very committee the Council appointed came to the Council with the suggestion that there be three divisions, why does the Council take it upon itself to do away with that? I am concerned about it. I would like to know why that occurs. Why doesn't it provide voting procedures in the present reorganization structure which allow the minority group in the proceedings, the powerful institutions, to have a veto vote on what is the vote of the majority? I have concern about that. I do not think the reorganization package as presented satisfies that concern.

I don't deny that . . .

President Ramer: [Interposing]: Mr. Bedell, may I interrupt you for a moment? I want the Convention to know my feeling about procedure here. I think we are facing complex and difficult matters, and we need all the contributions we can get before moving to a solution and a vote. I may be a little slow in recognizing calls for the question when I see a person who wants to speak, so I hope you will forgive me.

Mr. Bedell: I submit to you there can be no effective reorganization of this body until there has been first a reorganization of the NCAA Council. No matter what we do today, the reorganization of the Council is inevitable. It doesn't matter what we pass here, eventually Council will be reorganized. We all recognize that. But it seems to me if there are so many holes in the present reorganization package setup, we would be in error if we attempted to build any solid foundation on

a foundation that is presently full of holes. In other words, if there is complete dissatisfaction, and there seems to be complete dissatisfaction, it seems to me we would be in error in proceeding and allowing a foundation to be built upon this.

There is a proposal the ECAC will make on Saturday. I am not speaking for the ECAC, but they will make a proposal in regard to reorganization. I just feel strongly—and I think I am fudging a little bit—that we would be in gross error if we allowed this to be passed without first meeting the real challenge, the challenge of reorganizing the Council.

C. R. Gilstrap (University of Texas, Arlington): You might add I am the deal-maker. [Laughter] I would very simply like to say this, Mr. Chairman. I have yet to hear anyone approach these microphones and say there is no need for reorganization. I think we of the Committee, and I suspect the Council, would agree that perhaps what we have proposed is something less than perfect, but I think we all need to make a start.

We went away from Hollywood, Florida, having done nothing, after having considered this for some two or three years or longer. I am apprehensive we will go away from Chicago in exactly the same position, so I submit that we vote this Item 15 as the first step in a direction that is very much needed. Thank you. [Applause]

Edgar A. Sherman (Muskingum College): I was a member of the Committee and strongly favored three divisions. I am really not as adamant about the Council overruling the Committee as some other people seem to be. I think now that the quickest way to get this thing would be to divide at least constitutionally here today. I believe that each of us could work within our own divisions a lot better if we were divided. I am sure there are going to be three divisions in this organization before very long. We are leaning that way. We already have three championships in football, hopefully three in basketball; and I feel that some of the people who have spoken about the problems they have, like Ernie McCoy, ECAC, and others—I know they have problems and I sympathize, but I think they can best be solved if we divide into our divisions and go from there.

It has been suggested that the so-called top people in Division II are really concerned about schools like ours overruling them. We are not going to do that. We are more afraid of them than they are of us.

The division is natural. I might point to two things that make me feel that way. First of all, we sent out a questionnaire to those who thought there ought to be three divisions, and the answers were pretty well split. I think when the Football Committee divided Division II into two groups, it was a natural kind of thing. The fact of the matter is we sat down one day and put them in Division I or Division II in the College Division and wrote all of them and asked if they felt that was where they belonged. I think only four said they didn't.

It seems to me if we can at least get a start, we have been on dead center long enough. I feel we ought to start this and move from there. Thank you.

President Ramer: Thank you, Mr. Sherman. Is there any further discussion? I see no one approaching the microphone, and I am going to call for the vote on Item 15.

[Proposal 15 (page A-7) was defeated 218-224.]

Awards

President Ramer: Please turn now to Item No. 24. Do we have a representative from the University of Vermont to present this? This Chair recognizes Ed Donnelly.

J. Edward Donnelly (University of Vermont): Mr. Chairman, on the Awards Rule in the Constitution, I move the adoption of Item 24, amending Article 3, Section 1-(g)-(7).

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. President and delegates, I am sure I would shake you up if I were to begin by saying that all golfers are ineligible. However, I will say that the Golf Committee and your golf coaches feel that we are living a lie. Golf needs help. It needs it now, not tomorrow; and this is the place to get it. This amendment has been offered because the award rules present an insurmountable obstacle to golf. As you know, the award rules state that all awards have to be properly personalized and valued up to \$100.

Believe it or not, gentlemen—and this is very important—this award rule makes the winner of the U. S. Amateur Golf Championship ineligible to participate in our NCAA Championship.

Let me tell you what is happening in golf, and you will see we are fouled up. Two years ago Lanny Watkins won the U. S. Amateur Golf Championship. He came to Tucson as a member of the Wake Forest University golf team to play in our NCAA Championship event. A rival golf coach contacted the Golf Committee and requested that Lanny be declared ineligible to participate in that tournament because he had won the United States Amateur and received an award valued at more than the NCAA-allowable \$100.

The same golf coach had as his No. 1 golfer a state champion. All state golf association events are U.S.G.A. events, and they are all geared to a \$200 award limitation.

Gentlemen, if we had declared Lanny Watkins ineligible to participate in that tournament, I would not be up here. The adverse publicity that would have been associated with this disqualification would have prompted you immediately to have passed corrective legislation. I think I did you a favor. I was on the Golf Committee as an athletic director, and I made sure it didn't go through.

The Golf Committee has been turning their heads, and we as athletic directors have been turning our heads. We would not permit an ineligible transfer or a 1,600 non-predictor to represent our school in an NCAA Championship event, but we sign an eligibility blank that our golfer is eligible; and gentlemen, there is no way with this award rule that our golfers can be eligible. The properly personalized portion of the rule points the finger to every member of our golf teams.

Your golfers are talented. You wouldn't have them on your golf team if they were not talented. But, because of the fact that they are talented, gentlemen, they win awards. You and I have picked up a half-dozen golf balls in a golf tournament. Were they personalized? How do you personalize a half-dozen golf balls, a pair of golf shoes, a set of head covers or even a golf bag?

Is this what we want? These are all awards. These are sizeable awards associated with golf.

The United States Golf Association's award rules permit amateurs to receive awards up to the value of \$200. Let's face it, gentlemen,

whether you are in the University Division or the College Division, your golfers are all USGA golfers. They are brought up on the USGA rules. You bar them from playing in your program; but when your program ends in June, they go into summer competition. The NCAA doesn't run the program. They return to the USGA events. When they attend the state golf association event, whether they play in major or sectional invitational tournament or whether they are just playing there in the Fourth of July tournament at your country club, they are playing in USGA events with award values up to \$200; and they are not properly personalized.

One of my duties as a member of the Golf Committee was to run the East-West Championship. I had to contact young people to find out their pleasure so we could announce, as they teed off, what they had won and so forth. Believe me, gentlemen, you name the direction, and we had the champion. Gentlemen, they are all ineligible because they were playing in USGA events; and they are all geared to that \$200 award regulation.

It is unavoidable, the flagrant violation of the award rules. This amendment has been offered to help us.

Harry M. Cross (University of Washington): I would like to speak in opposition to this, not because of lack of sympathy with the problem posed but rather in the proposition that a study of the amateur rules of the NCAA has been undertaken by a special committee prompted substantially by the predicament or dilemma the golfers find themselves in.

That study very quickly demonstrated that there are somewhat comparable situations in other sports, and there is need to present the problem as a whole for careful study and enactment of legislation to accommodate in a reasonable and harmonious fashion the problems across the board.

Mr. Jess Hill is on that committee. Buddy White is on that committee, and Jack Fuzak and Howard Gentry. We prepared a preliminary report which in fact would have accommodated this in part, not to the extent this amendment would propose, also recognizing other problems of amateur rules and whether the amateur rules are realistic in the general sense, to the present climate of thinking around the country. It is our hope to have a final report available for the NCAA Council for the April meeting and to be presented at the next convention. It was our hope that it would be presented at this convention, but the volume of legislative matters to come before us made that impractical.

I think it is a desirable thing in general but maybe not specifically in light of considerable problems with respect to other sports. It should be considered in connection with our total amateur rules; and therefore, I urge this not be approved.

Wade R. Stinson (University of Kansas): Mr. President, I speak as chairman of this organization's Extra Events Committee and urge you defeat this proposal to isolate golfers out of the whole gamut of our awards group, which I think is wrong. I hope it is defeated.

[Calls for the question.]

President Ramer: The question has been called for. Let me remind you, this is a constitutional change requiring two-thirds majority vote.

[Proposal No. 24 (page A-13) was defeated 140-234.]

Delegate: Point of order, please! In the voting, I noticed several delegates holding up two paddles. According to our Constitution, there shall be no voting by proxy. Could we have the Chair's ruling on that?

President Ramer: Yes. In all instances my judgment is that these persons were voting for institutional representation and for conference representation, which is permitted. The only way we can determine for sure is to challenge it on the floor; so if you have an indication as a member of this Convention in challenging a particular vote, that may be done. You should know that we do have numbers of people representing affiliated organizations as well as institutions; and thereby, they deserve two votes.

Amateurism

President Ramer: We go now, gentlemen, to No. 25, also a constitutional change, a proposal concerning amateurism. Mr. Ed Donnelly, of the University of Vermont, will present this proposal.

Mr. Edward Donnelly (University of Vermont): Mr. Chairman, on the Amateurism rules in the Constitution, I move the adoption of Item 25, amending O.I. 3, following Constitution 3-1-(d).

[The motion was seconded.]

Our student-athletes are being penalized by us for playing in our program. The United States Amateur Rule states it is not a violation for an amateur to play in a pro-am game as long as he does not infringe on the amateur relations. This is what we want for our student-athletes. We permit our golfers to play with the pros, the Masters and any other tournament they are invited to. We think this is great for the image of our college golfers, and we would like to be considerate of our young men and permit them to play in these pro-ams.

[Proposal No. 25 (page A-13) was approved 362-31.]

Ice Hockey Eligibility

President Ramer: We move to Proposal 26, once again a constitutional change. Is there a representative from one of the sponsoring agencies in position now to present this to the convention?

Ralph A. Romano (University of Minnesota, Duluth): The particular point that I would like to make on this item, in reviewing our book, Item No. 21 and Item No. 13 indicate that according to our Constitution an individual may try out with a professional team and not lose his eligibility. It also indicates that an individual may play with a professional team provided he does not receive money for it and not lose his eligibility. But somehow we designate individuals who play in a Canadian amateur hockey program as professionals beyond this point.

President Ramer: Sir, are you making prefacing statements to your motion? Have you moved approval of this?

Mr. Romano: I, first of all, move the approval.

[The motion was seconded.]

Those were the two items for discussion. I do have a question of what makes the Canadian Amateur Hockey Association more professional than professional athletes. We seem to have a contradiction in the Constitution as to what a professional is. Or do we not?

President Ramer: We have a question, and I wonder if Dolph Samborski might attempt to answer that. Dolph Samborski, Yankee Conference, will you attempt, first of all, to answer this gentleman's question?

Adolph W. Samborski (Yankee Conference): As I understand, there are salaries involved plus the fact that the youngsters are playing with pros who do receive money; and under those two circumstances, they would be ruled ineligible.

Mr. Romano: Not according to the item I cited. It says you can play on a professional team as long as you do not receive compensation. We do have legislation which allows that each student must sign an affidavit indicating he did not receive money in excess of that allowed. So I am moving acceptance of this item, which at least would not rule the student who, strictly on a try-out basis, would be designated as a professional.

I know it is an area of limited interest but in my area of the country it is very important to those schools who are participating in the hockey program.

Mr. Samborski: Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak against this proposal in behalf of the Council. The 1971 NCAA Convention voted with little if any dissent that participating in the Canadian Major Junior League Hockey would professionalize the participants so he would be ineligible for intercollegiate athletics in this country. This was voted on recommendation of the special NCAA Hockey Committee. The 1972 Convention reaffirmed this position with another very strong vote in the fact of an amendment which was very similar to this Proposal No. 26. Proposal 26 intends to make participation in a Major Junior Hockey Canadian game permissible provided the youngster did not play in more than three games after January 1 in any hockey season. Actually by the time the youngster has played in three games after January 1, he could have competed in 30 to 35 major junior hockey games. Under the NCAA amateur rules, participation in only one such game would professionalize the youngster and make him ineligible for intercollegiate athletics.

I urge the defeat of this proposal.

John J. Hantz (Clarkson College of Technology): I urge the defeat of this motion. The rule we have now, we feel is working. The first reason.

No. 2, I am a little afraid of arbitrary numbers—three, four, five, and six.

No. 3, I think, is assuming that trying out is playing. The intent is to allow a try-out; but in the amendment, the statement is a certain number of games.

I urge the defeat of this amendment.

[Proposal No. 26 (page A-14) was defeated 18-242.]

Summer Financial Aid

President Ramer: Item No. 27 will be presented by Professor George Ilg.

George F. Ilg (Fresno State College): Mr. President, I move to amend Article 3, Section 1-(f) of the Constitution as outlined in Proposition No. 27.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent here is to apply the same financial aid policies to institutions which conduct regular summer terms, and those which conduct summer schools.

President Ramer: Any discussion? Gentlemen, to save time, I think I may on occasion ask for a voice vote and make a rule which will be

sustained unless overturned by the Convention.

[Proposal No. 27 (page A-14) was approved by voice vote.]

Graduate Eligibility

President Ramer: Item No. 28. The Chair recognizes Ross Smith of MIT to present this to the Convention floor.

Ross H. Smith (Massachusetts Institute of Technology): I move to amend Constitution Article 3, Section 3-(c).

I am not going to read the proposal through. I would state briefly that this proposal is intended to extend existing eligibility rules to any students who happen to accelerate their degree in order to enable them to enroll in graduate school in the same institution. There is no change in the existing four years of intercollegiate participation. There is no extension of the five-year rule. There is no implication of a transfer or a foreign student coming in who will participate as a graduate student. It is only to accommodate our own students who in this trend today do move to a degree in acceleration to get to graduate study.

It does eliminate the "fudging" that does take place in the delay of degree requirements. I know the present rule allows this to happen if he takes his degree in three and a half years to complete in four. I am simply proposing it go to the fifth year, and I hope you don't find too much wrong with it. Thank you.

[The motion was seconded.]

Marshall S. Turner, Jr. (Johns Hopkins University): I find myself a little reluctant about this. I want to ask a question. With the change in the freshman rule and the loss of freshmen, JC term, and so on, I am in favor of spreading out the benefits of competition; and the longer we keep the guy around able to play, it removes for me the chance for someone else to come along and play. I don't know whether this rule would mean we would lose any opportunity for new people coming in to play, by keeping fellows on who have been around four or five years.

I don't know whether Ross can help me out or not.

Mr. Smith: The case in point happens to be a hockey player who took an advanced degree. He is still with us. He missed a year of hockey due to injury in his sophomore year, and he is presently not playing. If this is passed it would accommodate that. That is about all I can say to it.

[Proposal No. 28 (page A-15) was defeated 228-167 (needed two-thirds).]

Outside Financial Aid

President Ramer: Item No. 29 will be presented to the Convention floor by Professor Harry Cross of the University of Washington, Seattle.

Harry Cross (University of Washington): Mr. President, I move the approval of the amendment to the Constitution with reference to permissible financial aid not having to be under the university administration as indicated in No. 29.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal originated with us at the University of Washington and extended to the Council; and the Council agrees, having modified it somewhat. Its origin is the program of the National Football Foun-

dation Hall of Fame to select high school scholar-athletes and make awards to them. This is a pattern which our own graduate scholarships are sent to the institutions of the recipients' choice and disbursed by the institutions. Under our rules, as they now exist, since the institution does not make the selection of the recipient, the receipt of that sort of aid is not proper. This proposal, however, is not limited to that sort of thing.

There are, as I think all of us know, many corporations, labor unions and others who have scholastic assistance for children of employees or children of members. I think all institutions are hopeful that more and more of their students will have financial aid, so they won't have to dig it up out of their own coffers.

Our further feeling in the general proposition of permissible aid, if you will recall, is that if athletic ability is a factor in determining that aid is given, then it becomes pay and professionalized. Our feeling is very strict on that, perhaps too strict. Therefore, this proposal permits athletic participation or skill to be among the criteria when the awarding agency makes its determination, so long as it can be said fairly it is essentially not the only one, and that the extra-curricular activities, service to the school, scholarship or lack of it I suppose and athletic participation established criteria. It also has in it language designed to prevent the creation of a brand new program that could become an indirect recruiting device.

I put it this way because I have been involved in one which is characterized as some sort of scholarship which therefore, perhaps should be categorized with our provision in our present law that scholarships available to the student body generally do not have to be calculated in financial aid.

This becomes an item which must be taken into account in determining whether the institution from its own funds may add to this fund in reaching the maximum. This is purposely not in here as something over and above our established maximum.

Rev. Wilfred H. Crowley (West Coast Athletic Conference): What are we voting on, the amendment as it appears?

President Ramer: The amendment has not been presented yet, Father Crowley. I am sorry. We had it on our printed sheet as No. 113.

Father Crowley: I would like to present it, if it is in order, Mr. President.

President Ramer: Father Crowley, gentlemen, is about to present this as an amendment to No. 29 which we are discussing.

Father Crowley: No. 113.

President Ramer: Have you moved the approval of the amendment yet?

Father Crowley: Not yet. I move the adoption of the amendment as it is worded there: "Such an award need not be counted in the maximum permissible assistance, provided it involves no obligation to compete in intercollegiate athletics at the institution of his choice."

[The motion was seconded.]

President Ramer: It has been seconded. Now discussion of the motion to amend.

Father Crowley: Gentlemen, I would like to file a mild protest. I submitted a Constitutional amendment, I think last August on this point; and I didn't hear what happened to it. I can understand the

position of the Council. We are submerged in all kinds of legislation, but I presented it to cover a type of award that is given, and I think we should encourage it because of the high school level, very similar to our own NCAA, awards given by the Football Foundation Hall of Fame. Just last month they honored five boys for academic excellence, who happen to be football players.

Now the conditions, in my amendment I specified those conditions that I submitted last August, a scholarship award won by a student-athlete during his high school career may be permitted without being counted in the allowable financial aid, financial aid based on academic excellence as determined by minimal grade point average of 3.1, and on leadership and ability displayed in extra-curricular activities, including athletics. Such a scholarship must be awarded by an agency independent of any educational institution and allow the student-athlete to select the college of his choice and place him under no obligation to participate in intercollegiate sports in the institution.

All those things are provided in the Football Foundation Hall of Fame in the awards given these boys. The 3.50 was very low for these boys. It seems to me if a boy wins an award, and it is counted toward the maximum that is allowed, and a boy who gets the 1.60 gets the full award, the first boy is being penalized because he is an outstanding scholar-athlete. I don't think that is fair.

To answer my good friend, Harry Cross, I certainly do not agree with the statement he made that this could be used in any way as a recruiting device because there is no obligation to compete in intercollegiate athletics. He is allowed free choice of his institution, and the award is primarily given for his academic achievement. That is the reason for it, and I would urge the adoption of the amendment as amended.

Mr. Cross: Father Crowley and I, of course, are in disagreement. If the proposal before you were limited to such things as the National Football Hall of Fame Award, I would be in complete agreement with it, because of the fact that it is a scholarship essentially recognizing successful high school athletic experience which to me would fall within our own acceptance of scholarship awards in calculation for the maximum permissible financial aid.

This proposal, as I indicated, is considerably broader in the possibility of becoming a recipient. I wasn't suggesting that the National Football Hall of Fame chapter awards had any potential for recruiting devices. The remark there was on the possibility of other agencies, other than something like the Football Hall of Fame, setting up a program like this that might become a subterfuge for recruiting, something we do not want. I think the language in the printed amendment protects us against that.

Again, this clearly will, and purposely will, permit a youngster who does not have high scholarships in high school but by reason of some connection with an agency which does make financial assistance available, able to take any institution he wishes. This would make that possible, and I think making it accountable as essentially a scholarship is a distortion. I urge you do not approve Father Crowley's amendment.

Father Crowley: Well, if it was made this way, it was made this way by the wording adopted instead of by my amendment because

now you are going to have several O.I.'s to explain what this means. The original amendment that I submitted was perfectly clear I think. I won't vote against it, but I think it is wrong to say that this type which is based on academic excellence must be counted. I certainly won't vote against it, but I think it was a mistake to change it.

[Proposal No. 113 (page A-63) was defeated by voice vote.]

President Ramer: Now we are discussing the main motion, No. 29.

Robert A. Latour (Bucknell University): About two years ago—this is merely a question of information—I offered on this floor a request for a change in the awards to the recipients of the Tony Lema scholarship awards. I wonder if this legislation would not permit the recipients of the Tony Lema Scholarship awards to be eligible. Could Mr. Cross answer that question?

President Ramer: Harry responds in the affirmative.

Robert F. Ray (University of Iowa): I would like to have an answer to this question. If Item 41 on the agenda and Item 42 should pass; and there are limitations in the terms of financial aids, how would aid proffered in this fashion be counted?

Mr. Cross: The proposal that we are voting on is obviously one which was developed without regard to the counting that is involved in this other set of proposals. I can only react. My initial reaction is: yes, it would probably have to be counted. But I guess I would want to think about it some more before I would want to be held to that reaction. I don't know, I guess is the easiest way to say it. [Laughter]

John J. Hinga (Indiana Collegiate Conference): One of our members is asking about the Chicago Evans Award. Would this be affected by this legislation? That is where a boy, a former caddy, is offered a stipend to go to school.

Mr. Cross: I think I can speed this up. The Chicago Evans award is already permissible.

[Proposal No. 29 (page A-15) was approved 261-113.]

Orientation Programs

President Ramer: No. 30, proposed by Iowa State University. Dr. John Mahlstede, I believe, is presenting this for Iowa State.

John Mahlstede (Iowa State University): Mr. Chairman and Colleagues, I move the approval of Amendment No. 30, which amends Article 3, Section 4-(b) of the Constitution.

[The motion was seconded.]

I wish to speak on behalf of this amendment which amends the Constitution to permit the prospective student-athletes after they have signed a letter of intent to become involved with legitimate academic orientation programs sponsored by the university immediately prior to matriculation.

This amendment and its companion, Amendment No. 60, provide for the modification of existing legislation, thereby extending to prospective student-athletes the same opportunities and privileges now given to the regular student body. It has been our experience and the experience of others that some students, because of their high school environment or because of the nature of their previous academic experience, lack the background necessary to adequately compete in the initial stages of their college or university experience. With the institution of the freshman rule, coupled with the rigors of two-a-day practice in the fall, it has become obvious that an aca-

demic orientation program designed to fit into a concentrated three-or-four-week program on such basics as study field, community orientation, professional development, personal development and academic advising is needed.

It is our opinion that this small investment in preparing certain students for academic competition supports the concept upon which this Association is founded, and on this I rest my case.

Louis Bright (Iowa State University): At the luncheon today, much emphasis was given by those who received awards to academic preparation for student-athletes. The awards that were given recognized athletic ability but mainly academic achievement. It is with this in mind that I present this proposal, and Iowa State presents this proposal.

One of the things that we have found at Iowa State, and also at other schools where there are similar programs, is that many of the schools who are receiving student-athletes with insufficient academic background find these students not only do not do as well in competing with their peers but, in many ways and at many times, are not able to finish their undergraduate program.

The intent of such a program as ours is to allow the student-athlete from six to eight weeks, depending on the program in the particular school, an opportunity to begin to lay some of the basics that are necessary.

We have passed out a handout, which some of you have seen, which would give some of the criteria we would use to evaluate what a student-academic-orientation program would be. I would like to cover a few of those.

One would be that it would be conducted by an academic department or a special service program within the university.

It would be for all students in the university or an extensive category, such as minority students, veterans, or whatever.

It would have courses, such as English, math, reading, biology, or other courses in which the student shows deficiency, as well as social orientation.

There would have to be a public schedule to be printed that could be shown.

Also that program would have to be justified to the NCAA in order for a particular member school to participate.

Now, one of the things I also would like to say is that one of the things I have heard is this would provide an opportunity for schools to cheat, to bring athletes in, in order to get classes early and things like that. The problem is not in the kind of proposal we are presenting. The problem in that would be the kind of fair play that is within the institutions that are represented here and also in your proceedings, because the program is designed to meet severe academic deficiencies a number of our student-athletes, particularly minority student-athletes manifest.

There are structures where this can be done within your present situation. Some say it could be used as a recruitment device. As Mr. Mahlstede pointed out, the people who would attend such programs have already been accepted by their university prior to their coming, so it could not be used in such a way.

Some have implied that too much is already being done for minority

students and others. Well, there are many students who do have severe academic deficiencies, and the expectation within the university is not only that they perform on the football or basketball field or whatever field or arena; but they must also perform in the classroom, and anything that can be done to overcome the deficiencies in their background would be worth it. There will be people who have deficiencies and who are severely handicapped. We are finding variations that range from 20 to 30 points between student-athletes and the rest of the student body.

I would like to paraphrase a statement by Mr. Shirley Gillam. If you are going to recruit academically deprived student-athletes, you will have to give them the special educational treatment they require. If you don't give them special attention, then stop recruiting them.

A new kind of consciousness is developing among athletes which will require recognition of both their academic, social and political need of expression. Postponement of such action adds to the critical problem of their competing academically within the university environment.

Billy J. Murphy (Memphis State University): We have such an orientation program; and if this could be tied in to only students who have already been admitted and predicted, it would serve one purpose. It appears in its present form that if we maintain our 1,600 prediction this could be utilized by some institutions to take students who are admissible to the university but not predictors and make them predictors.

If this is the case, I suggest we vote "no" on it.

[Proposal No. 30 (page A-15) was defeated 69-312.]

Enforcement

President Ramer: Proposal No. 31. The presentation of this to be presented to the convention floor by Professor Harry Cross of the University of Washington.

Harry Cross (University of Washington): Mr. President, I move the approval of the amendment to Article 3, Section 6 of the Constitution.

[The motion was seconded.]

The purpose of this is to help insure in the enforcement program that institutions will make all reasonable effort to have individuals cooperate in the investigative process.

Edward S. Betz (University of the Pacific): Mr. Chairman, I am very sympathetic with the NCAA's determination to have enforcement of the various regulations, but it seems to me the adoption of this and putting it into practice would hamper any particular investigation because to me it clearly violates the Fifth Amendment. If you have an investigator bring a student in and require him to fully cooperate, the investigator says, "Are you guilty?" and the young man, if he is, would be required to say, "Yes, I am guilty." This clearly violates the Fifth Amendment.

I think obviously it must be voted down.

Max O. Schultze (University of Minnesota, Twin Cities): My institution recognizes the need to strengthen our enforcement program, provided that this can be done without doing harm to the institution or to the integrity of the individuals who are involved.

Actually, as I understand this amendment, it compels individuals

who are associated with an institution to act as informers against members of their own institution, against members of their own university system; and it is for that reason that I would urge the Convention to vote against this proposal.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to give you a specific illustration of how this works. A couple of years ago two of our students, as well as several others, lived in the area of one of our outlying campuses and participated in a recreational basketball program in the facilities of our sister institution.

We became aware of this, and we reported the violation insofar as our students were concerned. The NCAA and the conference became aware of it. You are familiar with the case, Mr. Chairman. Subsequently I was requested by the Executive Offices of the NCAA to disclose to them the names of all individuals who participated in that program. I did not know those names, except from what I read in the paper.

In other words, the NCAA Executive Offices, on the basis of such an amendment, could ask me to act as an informer against my own sister institution; and you know in what kind of position that would put me.

There are many states now where the educational system has been integrated, and this would happen over and over again. I urge the defeat of this amendment.

Marshall Turner (Johns Hopkins University): I don't want to get into the business of due process in a voluntary organization or anything like that, but the question my folks have raised is: does this amendment get us into the business of requiring them to disclose and have a search of their files if requested by the NCAA? They ask this question, not with the intent to disrupt or hurt an investigation, but simply because of the fact that the university establishes certain rules about who can and who cannot have access to the files of the university, student records and so on. They raise the question: if the investigation should take place; and they want to see some files, and it so happens the university rules say those files are not available to such people, where do we stand on that? I don't want to be in the position of not cooperating.

President Ramer: Marshall Turner is raising this as a question, and I would like to ask that one of our colleagues in law respond. Harry, would you attempt this response?

Harry Cross: (University of Washington): I don't think I can answer in total. It seems to me that we cannot as a voluntary association do more than require institutions to do what our rules ask, up to but not beyond what some binding law prohibits them from doing. If there were a conflict between an institution's own voluntarily adopted regulations, in the sense that there wasn't some privacy or constitutional protection against disclosure, I think you then would have a conflict between the institution and—I don't want to say—"we" but it is an idiosyncrasy against the NCAA idiosyncrasy—you would have an institutional violation.

I don't see how—nor do I understand this is intended—the NCAA could authorize its staff in investigating an enforcement program to compel the invasion of privacy, to compel a disclosure which is contrary to the constitutional protection of the individual. I don't think this is designed to do that.

Speaking to Max Schultze's point, I think he does have a point there. This might go that far. I think what this is designed to do is to ask the member institution in effect not to tell their staff and their students to be quiet. This has happened occasionally rather than what ordinarily happens, that the institution cooperates fully.

If the institution refuses to cooperate in the terms of forbidding the full investigation, that would be an attempt, as best they could, to make it a defective investigation. Then the institution would be in violation. This is what it is designed to do. I recognize it can be argued that it goes farther than that, but it doesn't have that effect.

J. D. Morgan (University of California, Los Angeles): Mr. Chairman, I want to be sure that everyone realizes that I believe in the philosophy of what this says, but it does not say who is to determine whether the individual cooperated fully or not. It leaves open the possibility that the investigator may not have gotten the answers that he wanted; and as a result, it may be his determination that the young man or the institution did not cooperate fully when in actuality the institution believes that it did.

I would still subscribe to the philosophy, but ask the membership to vote against this specific amendment.

George Bisacca (Eastern College Athletic Conference): I think there is one point that should not be overlooked. I agree completely with Mr. Cross's interpretation of No. 31. I think, however, you are going to run into a problem on No. 38 where you require that the student-athlete himself be punished by being declared ineligible if he himself fails to disclose fully to the investigating staff.

That, I think, is more precisely where your Fifth Amendment question would come in. We have recently had a case in the ECAC in which the authority of the NCAA, or the ECAC as it was in our case, to directly rule the student ineligible was seriously questioned. The institution would have to determine him ineligible.

So in considering No. 31, I don't feel, in my legal opinion any way, there is a question of violating the Fifth Amendment because the institutions voluntarily subscribe to join the NCAA, and if they choose to waive their rights as institutions, that is up to them. If their rules prohibit you from looking at their files, I don't know what you can do about that, but I think you have a problem in No. 38.

[Proposal No. 31 (page A-16) was defeated by voice vote.]

Five-Year Rule

President Ramer: We will go to No. 32. I believe Al Kornberg, representing the Atlantic Coast Conference, will present this.

Allan Kornberg (Atlantic Coast Conference): Mr. Chairman, I would like to propose that this body defer consideration of Items 32 and 33 until after it has disposed of Item 42, the Financial Aid Item.

President Ramer: You have heard the proposal. Let me ask if there is objection to the deferring of these two. There is no objection. Now, sir, will you move to change the order?

Mr. Kornberg: In that event, I would like to move that this body change the order of consideration of items on the agenda so items 32 and 33 now be considered after Item 42.

[The motion was seconded.]

[The motion was defeated by voice vote.]

President Ramer: We are now facing No. 32, Mr. Kornberg.

Mr. Kornberg: I move the adoption of Item No. 32 as stated.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent is obvious, to make the individual's participation in intercollegiate athletics concurrent with the normal tenure of his undergraduate career. The assumption underlying this proposal is that permitting an individual to participate in intercollegiate athletics for an additional year solely for athletic reasons and for the enhancement of an athletic program cannot be rationalized in educational terms. Indeed, to us it seems to refute the designation that we apply for participants in intercollegiate athletics, that of students first and athletes secondarily.

Moreover, at a time when intercollegiate athletic programs are under attack with their supposed professionalism by significant elements within the university community and within the general public, it appears to us that the retention of the five-year participation rule or "red shirting," as the lay public most frequently refers to it, provides the opponents of intercollegiate athletics with a convenient symbol, something they can draw out to focus opposition and build opposition to intercollegiate athletics in general.

We do recognize there may be circumstances under which the addition of a year of participation may be earned. Consequently there are three provisions within this item that would provide exceptions to the new proposal.

We urge the consideration of this item and hopefully support for its adoption.

Michael M. Fleischer (Herbert H. Lehman College): I would urge you to vote against this item. I question whether or not the assumptions it states are valid. It seems to me today the college experience is getting longer and longer due to drop-outs for various and sundry reasons. It may be valid argument to extend to five years, six or seven or something like that, but certainly to restrict the time. We have more and more pressure to lengthen the college year by more work programs out of school and so forth and so on.

The other assumption that this is "red shirting" I think is valid also. I would urge you to defeat this proposal.

Delegate: I speak against this motion. Our institution is primarily a five-year cooperative college. Ninety per cent of our students are required to take five years to complete undergraduate work. This would present a hardship on our students if they were not permitted to participate in our program in the five-year requirement. Many of our academic requirements prevent our students from participating now in their fourth year under the five-year program. I would urge you to vote against this proposal.

Ernest C. Casale (Temple University): I would like to oppose this amendment on behalf of the Eligibility Committee of the NCAA. The present rule has worked very well, and I think it has helped the NCAA office and helped our athletic directors in their relationship with coaches and athletes. A four-year rule exception opens a whole can of worms. With over 600 schools, it would be impossible for the NCAA Eligibility Committee to consider all the requests which certainly would be presented.

In addition, I would add, to define non-athletic reasons would be a most difficult job. I am sure there would be an infinite number of reasons.

I see no reason for changing. I would suggest you vote it down.

J. William Davis (Texas Technological University): I was going to say the same thing Ernie Casale has just said. I am sorry, but I think the three exceptions make this an impossible and intolerable sort of rule, and I would urge you to vote against it.

Jack Davis (Oregon State University): One other comment. We heard a number of young men at noon today describe their backgrounds, which included student participation in the whole plan on the campus, not just in athletics. If our students are going to participate on the campus, it makes academic sense that they be given time to do so. To force a man to compete in four years counters any good judgment.

I move you vote against the amendment.

[Proposal No. 32 (page A-16) was defeated by voice vote.]

Hardship

Mr. Kornberg: In view of the nature of No. 32, we withdraw Item No. 33.

President Ramer: Is there objection? Then the Chair rules that Item 33 may be withdrawn at the request of the sponsors.

Five-Year Rule

President Ramer: Item No. 34, a proposal relating to the Five-Year Rule, to be presented by Dr. Howard Gentry of Tennessee State University.

Howard Gentry (Tennessee State University): Mr. President, I move to add an O.I. 16 following Constitution 3-9-(a), renumbering subsequent interpretations.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent is to provide an extension for student-athletes who, for a bona fide reason, cannot enter college immediately upon completing their obligations under one of the three exceptions indicated in 3-9-(a)—time spent in the armed services, on official church missions or with recognized foreign-aid services of the United States Government.

[Proposal No. 34 (page A-17) was approved by voice vote.]

Summer Basketball

President Ramer: Item No. 35, relating to Summer Basketball. Is there a representative from MacMurray College prepared to present Item No. 35 to the convention floor?

Michael M. Fleischer (Herbert H. Lehman College): Mr. President, is it necessary for the sponsoring institution to make the motion?

President Ramer: No.

Mr. Fleischer: I so move then.

[The motion was seconded.]

Richard P. Koenig (Valparaiso University): Mr. Chairman, this is the same motion that has been in front of us for the last two years. I will not go through the same speech I made the last two years; but I will, as I did for the last two years, urge you to defeat this. This resolution is the same thing which the gambling scandals which came up in the 1950's created. Legitimate organized basketball is permitted in the existing regulations.

So I urge your defeat of this proposal. I won't add any more or take any more time.

Edward P. Markey (St. Michael's College): As President of the New England Basketball Coaches Association, I know we support this. I know if Bill Wall were here, as the Immediate Past President of National Association of Basketball Coaches, who actually proposed this legislation, he would support this.

The actual evolution of this legislation of course is this. Dick Koenig made reference to the fact that we are concerned so much about the scandals in the past, and we are. There is no question about it. My concern or the concern of most of the coaches is the fact that we are actually discriminating against a group of young athletes who have very stringent regulations under which they can participate in a summer session, in a summer league. Let's not be so naive as to think that if the gamblers want to get at any particular individual they are going to worry whether it is in a schoolyard, a classroom or a movie house. If they want to get to someone, they are going to get to someone; and our keeping young men from participating under stringent regulations is, I believe, a very naive approach. I think it is unfair to keep young men from playing in the summer when the restrictions are such that they actually preclude the problems that we foresee.

[Proposal No. 35 (page A-17) was defeated 139-248.]

Out-of-Season Basketball

President Ramer: We move now to No. 36, another proposal concerning Out-of-Season Basketball. The Chair will ask Dr. Ernie Casale, of Temple University, to make the presentation.

Ernest Casale (Temple University): Mr. Chairman, in view of the feeling of the Convention as expressed in the last vote, I would like to move Proposal No. 36.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent on this is actually to close the loophole in the present legislation and actually make our legislation consistent. At the present time our student-athletes cannot participate in outside basketball after the season, defined as the last game of the NCAA championship. The loophole is that the present rule does not prohibit outside participation between your last game and the last game of the NCAA championship.

If it is wrong to play outside basketball for the various reasons we have discussed after the NCAA championship and certainly during the summer, it would be wrong to play outside basketball between your last game and the last NCAA championship game. There are very competitive organized leagues in that period in March, so the student-athlete can get just as involved as he can during the summer. So if you feel that way about Proposal No. 36, I think you should close this loophole.

[Proposal No. 36 (page A-18) was approved by voice vote.]

Soccer Eligibility

President Ramer: No. 37, concerning Soccer Eligibility. The Eastern College Athletic Conference is proposing this. Is there a representative here? Scotty Whitelaw, commissioner of that Conference.

Robert M. Whitelaw (Eastern College Athletic Conference): Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of this item to amend Article 3, Section 9-(d).

[The motion was seconded.]

Again, with the rapid growth in the popularity of soccer sweeping the country in recent years, there are countless amateur teams playing soccer 12 months in the year. Under present NCAA legislation, which we are abiding by, all amateur teams on which our student-athletes compete outside the regular varsity team must receive certification from the NCAA Council.

In my experience in the East, and perhaps it is the same throughout the country, we feel in many cases either the student-athletes are not aware of this situation as a result of not requesting the teams to submit to certification through the NCAA office, or sometimes the teams themselves are not aware of this regulation.

I think, first, this legislation has outlived its usefulness, which we adopted some eight or nine years ago when we had difficulty with the professional league; but since this was passed it is binding on the student-athletes.

I recommend this for adoption.

Ernest Casale: (Temple University): I would like to support this. I am on the Eligibility Committee of the NCAA, and we have a lot of problems because of it. I think it is one thing we ought to be consistent on. This is the only sport that requires individual team certification. It is not so in baseball because truthfully, in baseball those which are sponsored or supported by professional baseball receive the approval of the NCAA. But there are many soccer teams playing today where our teams are ineligible. We found a lot of it this past year. There are soccer teams playing on playgrounds, and the playground team needs the approval of the NCAA, filling out forms on finances and so on.

[Proposal No. 37 (page A-18) was approved by voice vote.]

Enforcement

President Ramer: We are moving to No. 38, another amendment concerned with enforcement. Harry Cross, University of Washington.

Harry Cross (University of Washington): Mr. President, in line with the discussion with reference to the matter of No. 31, it is my feeling, although I have not discussed this with the NCAA Council which is the sponsor of this proposal, at the request of the Committee on Infractions that unanimous consent to subdivide the question so subsection (4) would be voted on separately from subsection (5).

President Ramer: The Chair will approve that if there is no objection from the floor. There is no objection.

Mr. Cross: Mr. Chairman, I move the question be divided.

[The motion was seconded.]

[The motion to divide the question was approved 155-137.]

Mr. President, I move the approval of Item No. 38, subdivision (5).

[The motion was seconded.]

I believe there has been developed a weakness in the identification of individual eligibility of members. There has been nothing expressly stated on what I think most people felt was inherent in standards to be eligible to compete. Subdivision (5) then does say that an individual shall be ineligible if he obviously fails to deport himself in accordance with the generally recognized high standards of sportsmanship.

This may sound like an impossible, vague standard. I would point out it establishes two things. One is it says he must have obviously failed. This means you get to the point where he fails it must be obvious.

Secondly "generally recognized high standards of sportsmanship" I can assure you can be identified in case law of this country as an acceptable standard.

I move its approval.

[The motion was seconded.]

Max O. Schultze (University of Minnesota, Twin Cities): I hate to prolong the discussion. However, I would like to express our complete support for the motion Mr. Cross has made. I believe it is very important that the Bylaws and our Constitution state that.

I would fully support this. However, I am also stating I am very happy to know that we get a divided vote because we shall oppose very strenuously Item No. 4.

Michael M. Fleischer (Herbert H. Lehman College): For the very same reasons of the general vagueness of the terms involved and the questionability of enforcing something like this, I would oppose it in principle. I am for adhering to the standards of sportsmanship, but it is very difficult for me to understand how we can pass something like this without knowing what they are and without knowing how we can arrive at it and who arrives at it.

I would urge the defeat of this.

M. Edward Wagner (California Collegiate Athletic Association): Point of information from the Committee. Do I gather from this that maybe somebody who had a 15-yard penalty or unsportsmanlike conduct in football might become ineligible, or who had a technical foul in basketball for example? I think it is rather nebulous when we say we try to enforce what is highly recognized as standard in sportsmanship.

Mr. Cross: I don't picture that sort of violation of the rules unless it is very unusual in terms of an obvious purposeful violation and intention to hurt or something like that. I think your playing rules reach that sort of thing. I think Professor Schultze put his hand on the matter entirely. A rather unfortunate situation in Minnesota last year in a game was really the thing that triggered the need for something like this. It is my recollection that when that matter was challenged, the absence of express words rather than accepted standards forced some difficulty.

Robert R. Peck (Williams College): I fully support the intention, and I think most of our institutions do. However, I would urge strongly the defeat of (5) for the following reasons: It is much too vague, in the first place. Does it involve the 15-yard penalty? Does it involve flagrant stick swinging in hockey? Does it involve a kid who is obviously disrespectful during the playing of the National Anthem? Does it involve gestures to the stands or to the opposing coaches? I think this is an institutional matter, and I think the institutions want to handle it and are very serious about handling these things. I do not think it is a NCAA matter; and I strongly urge, because of the vagueness of it and the uneven application, that we leave it up to the institutions.

Fred L. Miller (Arizona State University): The intent is fine. This conflicts, in my eyes, with Section 2 of the Constitution which states that the responsibility for control of conduct of student-athletes in intercollegiate athletics rests with the institutions. I urge the defeat of this particular amendment.

[No. 38-(5) (page A-19) was defeated by a show of hands.]

Mr. Cross: I guess now, to finally carry out the responsibility to the Council, I move the approval of Item 38-(4).

[The motion was seconded.]

[No. 38-(4) (page A-19) was defeated by a show of hands.]

President Ramer: Gentlemen, you have been very patient and indulgent this afternoon. I am grateful to you. We are in recess until 9 o'clock in the morning.

[The Convention recessed at 6:08 p.m.]

BUSINESS SESSION

Saturday Morning, January 13, 1973

The Convention was called to order at 9:10 a.m. by President Ramer.

President Ramer: Gentlemen, our final session is continuing with the presentation of the report of the Memorial Resolutions Committee. On Thursday, you will recall there were additional names submitted to the Chairman. I would like to recognize this morning Mr. Edwin P. Horner, Chairman of the Memorial Committee, who will present a supplementary report.

I will invite you once again, if you find names still omitted from that presentation, to meet Mr. Horner here at the podium at the time of our noon recess. You will then have an opportunity to present additional names that will be included in the list for publication.

13. SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT OF THE MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE

Edwin P. Horner (Baylor University): I will ask you to stand for a moment in silent prayer after I finish reading the names of these people.

Lyman Frimodig, Michigan State University

Frank Forbes, Morehouse College

Charles McDaniel, Indiana University

Edward Oglesby, Florida A & M University

Clarence Montgomery, Florida A & M University

Harry Russell, Washington College

James Paterson, Wabash College

William John, Former Commissioner, Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association.

[The assembly rose and stood for one minute in silent tribute to the memory of their departed colleagues.]

President Ramer: Thank you, Mr. Horner. Your response signifies Convention acceptance of the amended report of that committee.

You might be interested in knowing that at noon yesterday 449 institutions and 31 conferences were in registration, a total convention delegation of 770 representatives, and the largest number of votes cast yesterday was 480. All of these totals represent the largest in the history of our association for its annual Convention.

14. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Swimming Committee

I call your attention to Proposal No. 109 having to do with amendment to Proposal No. 9. This was the famous discussion having to do with the recognition of diving competency. I am going to ask Walter Hass if he will present this at this time.

Walter L. Hass (University of Chicago): Mr. President, I move that we amend Proposal No. 9 with the amendment to the Bylaws 7-3-(f). This was the first controversy of the convention, and we settled it illegally, so we must do it according to the Constitution. I move that this be accepted.

[The motion was seconded.]

This simply means that one out of 13 men on the Swimming Committee will have expertise in diving.

[Proposals No. 109 (page A-62) and No. 9 (page A-3) were approved by voice vote.]

One-Year Awards

President Ramer: We move now to consideration of Proposal No. 39, a Constitutional revision proposal concerning the one-year awards. I would like to ask Mr. Wade Stinson to present that to the Convention at this time.

Wade R. Stinson (University of Kansas): Mr. President. Gentlemen, Item No. 39 is a proposal to amend Article 3, Section 4-(b). I move its adoption.

[The motion was seconded.]

Gentlemen, the intent is as indicated, to limit financial aid awards to a period of one year.

[Proposal No. 39 (page A-20) was approved by a show of hands.]

Non-Renewal of Aid

President Ramer: No. 40. This also will be presented by Mr. Stinson.

Mr. Stinson: Proposal No. 40 should indicate a slight editorial change before I move its adoption. In the bold print, the first sentence, the second line, change "renewal" to "grant;" insert "not" between "has" and "been;" and change "withheld" to "renewed" so it will read in this manner: "In the latter event, the institution also shall inform the student-athlete that if he believes the grant has not been renewed for questionable reasons."

The proposal is to amend Article 3, Section 4-(d). Mr. President, I move its adoption.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Stinson: As indicated, gentlemen, it is merely to provide a means whereby the student-athlete, if he feels he has been unfairly handled in the renewal of his grant, if it is improper, he has an avenue to appeal.

[Proposal No. 40 (page A-20) was approved by a show of hands.]

Limitations on Financial Aid Awards

President Ramer: We come to Proposal No. 41, concerning Limitations on Financial Aid Awards. This will be presented by Mr. John Fuzak.

John A. Fuzak (Michigan State University): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to propose the amendment of the Constitution, Article 3, Section 4, by adding what appears in bold-faced type. I so move.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Chairman, there is an amendment to the amendment, which appears as No. 114. I would move the amendment to the amendment by striking the last part of that bold-faced type, really the second sentence, starting with "In accordance."

President Ramer: The motion to amend has been made.

[The motion was seconded.]

[Proposal No. 114 (page A-64) was approved by a show of hands.]

Mr. Fuzak: Mr. Chairman, very briefly, I think it is very important to provide enabling legislation which will permit the establishment

of controls and limitations in the state of the situation that exists nationally facing intercollegiate athletics. It is a very important kind of enabling legislation. I urge you to approve it.

Robert F. Ray (University of Iowa): Mr. President, I rise in support of this proposed amendment to the Constitution. It seems to me it is critical that we here in this convention achieve some significant steps toward the reduction of the cost of our intercollegiate athletic programs. We are aware of the fact that the American Council on Education has recently taken steps to come into the whole question of the role of intercollegiate athletics in the collegiate scene. They are taking steps to review the whole situation and are urging that steps toward economy be taken. I am sure all of your presidents, or most of them, are aware that President Sanford, of Duke University, suggested a coordinated effort on the part of the university presidents and the NCAA to support legislation to reduce expenditures and balance budgets.

A recent letter to the President of the University of Iowa indicated he had received over 100 replies in response to his urging that the presidents work together and that the institutions face this issue head-on.

In the face of inflation and the general economic crisis that faces all of higher education, I earnestly hope this Convention will support this enabling legislation and approve one of the proposals that follows it in terms of implementation through the Bylaws.

William H. Baughn (University of Colorado): Mr. President, I sympathize with the statement that has been made. Our legislation was conceived though on the basis of divisional setup. It seems inappropriate at this point, since that has failed, for this large group now to vote on limitations that will apply to a very small percentage of the total and will be completely ineffective as far as the majority is concerned.

Although I sympathize with Mr. Ray's proposal, I urge defeat of this amendment.

Robert M. Whitelaw (Eastern College Athletic Conference): Mr. President, I would like a little further explanation of what is behind this. As I understand it, if this passes by a two-thirds vote, then the specifics relating to the numbers limitations would be passed by a majority vote.

President Ramer: That is correct. Under Proposal No. 41 and subsequent ones, yes, it enables you.

Mr. Whitelaw: It enables you to take the numbers out of the Constitution and put it in the Bylaws.

President Ramer: Correct.

Mr. Whitelaw: I thought Proposal No. 41 was principally directed, assuming that reorganization passed. Since reorganization has failed, why are we taking this enabling feature?

President Ramer: Scotty, my immediate reaction is there was no contingency there, but I would welcome comments from our parliamentarian on this.

Harry Cross (University of Washington): Mr. President, I disagree entirely with Scotty. You may recall that a special Committee on Offers of Financial Aid and Costs was set up under the chairmanship of Bill Flynn of Boston College. These basic proposals came out of

that committee at a time when there was no active proposal in regard to division of the membership at all.

You may also recall that at our last convention, where there was a question of whether we could have some special convention. The alternative of having a special convention to consider this matter—that is, financial aid problems as an independent thing and perhaps the only item on the special convention—was proposed to you. The proposal of a special convention, of course, was defeated, but it is incorrect to say that is tied in in any sense to a division of the house.

Robert F. Ray (University of Iowa): Mr. President, it seems to me the proposals that follow, in terms of the careful work by the Council and two or three conferences accommodate the fact that division did not occur yesterday, that provisions were not made for a division into two groups. They do take into account the serious problems faced by the larger institutions that have grants-in-aid programs.

I would ask my friends of the ECAC, having defeated and worked so diligently to have defeated the division proposition, having worked so diligently to that end, now to search their consciences in terms of their proposal that we don't need to divide, and to take into account the problems of those that could have been solved had we divided. This is one of them.

Edgar A. Sherman (Muskingum College): I would like to speak in support of this proposal. I still think we need to get off center some place. We voted down reorganization; and now if we vote this down, we are right back where we were.

I think reorganization is still inevitable and will come soon, and I would like to see us be in position to begin operating when we get off center and start to move.

Richard Keonig (Valparaiso University): I think it is indeed important that we put this in perspective. Scotty, I have to strongly disagree with your statement because we have had financial aid proposals in front of us, and there is no connection between proposals on financial aid limitation and reorganization from the historical standpoint. These were here in front of us. We considered them last year. We even went to the point that we wanted to consider a special convention, and now for us to consider the possibility of voting down an opportunity to even consider a proposal seems to me to be going way too far.

I urge support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 41 (page A-20) was approved as amended 262-116.]

Financial Aid Limitation

President Ramer: We are ready now for Proposal No. 42, and I would ask Mr. Wade Stinson to present this.

Mr. Stinson: Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen: Item No. 42 adds a new Bylaw, No. 5. I move its adoption.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. President, there is an amendment, No. 115, Amendment Proposal No. 42, Bylaw 5-1-(c)-(4), indicating the table. I move the amendment to the amendment.

[The motion was seconded.]

This amendment establishes the table. It stipulates the table, formerly only for Division I, will apply to the entire membership.

A. M. Holmes (Missouri Valley Conference): Is it in order here to

amend the table, or do you vote on the table as amended by Mr. Stinson there first?

President Ramer: I would assume we vote on that and then consider amendments. Is there further discussion of the amendment?

[Proposal No. 115 (page A-64) was approved by a show of hands.]

Mr. Stinson: Mr. President, gentlemen, it was the attempt of the Council to face this question in two parts; that is, to vote on football and basketball as one package and the other remaining sports as another package.

Mr. President, I move to divide the question.

[Motion to divide question was seconded and approved by a show of hands.]

Mr. Stinson: Mr. President, I move the adoption of Item No. 42 as amended, as it applies to football and basketball.

[The motion was seconded.]

Keith L. Broman (University of Nebraska): I think it would be appropriate; and unless I am ruled out of order, I should like to have you consider Proposal No. 44 as an amendment to the amended division of the question, the impact of which is to change the football awards to 35 and 80 rather than 30 and 75. Would it not be appropriate to consider this at this point?

President Ramer: You are proposing Amendment No. 44 and this is in order. Is there a second to the motion to amend through the use of No. 44 in your agenda?

[The motion was seconded.]

Louis G. McCullough (Iowa State University): Mr. President, the Big Eight Conference recently lowered its limitations. We used to have 45 per year, and we recently went to 120. We feel that in our conference, our football has been self-supporting and helps our other varsity sports, and 115 would certainly help those people who live in what we call non-thickly-populated areas.

We would like to have this as a compromise from 120 to make it 115. I urge you to support this amendment.

[Proposal No. 44 (page A-24) was defeated by a show of hands.]

A. M. Holmes (Missouri Valley Conference): Mr. President, we would like to propose the amendment listed as No. 116, an amendment to No. 42. I would so move.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Holmes: Mr. President, our intent is simply to combine these two columns and have you consider maximum grants in force at one time, establishing the total of 105 for football and 19 for basketball. Simply, there would be no consideration of maximum initial grants in this proposal.

Marshall Turner (Johns Hopkins University): I am not sure where is the right place to raise this question, but there are a good many schools which have never operated with any kind of numbers, and they would be kind of confused in terms of working on their problems if this legislation goes through.

As I understand it, if an institution did not choose to work with these tables, the penalty to them for not doing so would simply be their inability to attend an NCAA championship. Is there any other institutional penalty of any kind involved if an institution should say, "We cannot limit our number because our philosophy is that any kid

who wants to come out to play should be allowed to do so, whether he is given aid or not?"

President Ramer: The question is: Would the application be for participation in NCAA events alone?

Mr. Turner: Do you have some other rules which eliminate practice and play in season? I want to be sure we know what the limitation of numbers involves.

President Ramer: Yes, I think your question is clear. I would like for either Marc or Walter to respond.

Mr. Plant: I cannot answer that question.

Ernest Casale (Temple University): I would think this is not so because it first appears in the Constitution which sets up the machinery for this; and the Constitution, of course, implies NCAA championship. To me it would be the same as the recruiting rules that are referred to in the Constitution only by saying the recruiting rules are found in the Bylaws, and obviously they apply to all in-season functions.

President Ramer: Ernie Casale of Temple University informs us the application would be for all in-season eligibility. I wonder if we have any rejoinder on that from those in position to know.

Mr. Turner: I would ask further then; are all the controls or legislation and Bylaws, general Bylaw information, or those Bylaws affecting eligibility for NCAA events also interpreted to mean that they affect us in the entire season competition each institution has, regardless of whether they are going to participate in NCAA events?

President Ramer: I would think this would not be assumed logically from Ernie's statement.

Mr. Turner: Then if this new Bylaw would go in with some limitation on the number of people you can have on your squad, this would apply to in-season. Or did I hear him wrong? I got the impression he was saying it would apply to in-season.

President Ramer: My understanding was that Ernie's statement maintained that the limitations as voted here would apply for eligibility in season.

I would like to ask our Executive Director if this would be true under his interpretation.

The answer is, yes. I would like to ask our parliamentarian if this would be true under his interpretation. Ernie Casale responded to Marshall Turner's question. You would agree with Ernie?

Mr. Plant: Yes.

President Ramer: This means to me, gentlemen, as your presiding officer, that in our vote here we must make the assumption that your approval of specific financial aid limitation would apply for in-season eligibility as well as eligibility for NCAA events.

John McKenna (Georgia Institute of Technology): I cannot conceive this body would consider eliminating initial award limitations. To impose a total limit with no initial limit is an open invitation to bring in any freshmen scholar-athletes and then select and retain only the best. This is a one-year tryout camp when coupled with the one-year grant.

Over the years Georgia Tech has graduated 85 per cent of its athletes who matriculated as NCAA grant-in-aid recipients. This will never be matched by Tech or any other school if this is enacted. I

urge you to restore the initial award limitation.

[Proposal No. 116 (page A-65) was defeated by a show of hands.]

Darrell Medcalf (University of Puget Sound): I wonder if someone from the package is going to propose Amendment No. 117 because I believe that has an effect on how many of us may look at this number limitation.

President Ramer: Mr. Medcalf, some collaboration prior to the meeting this morning assumed that No. 117 would apply to the next motion, the other sports category, rather than football and basketball.

Now we are wondering whether a representative of the Atlantic Coast Conference or the Big Ten Conference or the Mid-American and so on might want to place No. 43 in motion as an amendment. I think I am correct in stating that has not been proposed.

Wayne Duke (Big Ten Conference): Mr. President, I would like to move an amendment to the motion to provide for the provisions of No. 43 providing for a reduction of the total basketball grants to 18 rather than 19.

[The motion was seconded.]

President Ramer: I would like to remind the convention of an editorial error. This has been called to my attention as an editorial error, that number 19 in the proposal should be changed to 13 and number 18 should be changed to 12. Now, I would rule this as an editorial change and assume, Wayne, that this is consistent with your motion.

Mr. Duke: Correct.

President Ramer: All right. The motion was made for Proposal No. 43 as corrected editorially.

[The motion was seconded.]

It is made and seconded. Now this becomes yet another amendment to No. 42. We are discussing the amendment to the amendment. Is there discussion?

Delegate: Will you please repeat what you just said?

President Ramer: Yes, indeed. A proposed editorial correction has been made in No. 43, namely the substitution of the figure 13 for the 19 in italics, and the substitution of the number 12 for the 18 in bold face. Wayne Duke of the Big Ten, who made the motion, has accepted this editorial correction and the motion to amend has been seconded. Is there further discussion?

William E. Leckie (Colorado School of Mines): Point of order, Mr. Chairman. In Proposal 43 "Division I" remains. Do you not wish to strike that?

President Ramer: Yes, indeed, and the Chair would rule this an editorial correction, striking the last phrase "for Division I basketball." This was also assumed, Mr. Leckie, and I appreciate your suggestion, under Proposal 44 for "Division I football." I suppose Division I football was not entirely inconsistent, but both of those qualifying phrases should be omitted since you defeated the divisions proposal yesterday. Thank you, sir.

[Proposal 43 (page A-24) was approved 224-119.]

President Ramer: Now we are discussing the main motion as amended, No. 42, as amended.

[Proposal No. 42 (page A-21) for football and basketball was approved as amended by a show of hands.]

President Ramer: Now, Mr. Stinson, for the second division of No. 42.

Wade Stinson (University of Kansas): Mr. President and gentlemen, I move the adoption of Proposed Amendment No. 42 as amended and divided for sports other than football and basketball, all other sports.

President Ramer: Is there a second?

[The motion was seconded.]

The motion has been made and seconded to continue our attention to No. 42 through its applicability to sports other than football and basketball.

If there is no discussion, the Chair recognizes Wiles Hallock, who will present Amendment No. 117.

Wiles Hallock (Pacific 8 Conference): Mr. President, I move to adopt Proposition No. 42 as it applies to those sports other than football and basketball in the manner proposed by No. 117.

[The motion was seconded.]

Gentlemen, the intent of this amendment as it applies to sports other than football and basketball is to permit the awarding of maximum additional awards, in other words those awards in Column 2 of the table, on the same basis as the initial awards. Putting it another way, it will administer these continuing awards on the basis of an aggregate expenditure just as the initial awards are administered, so the number of recipients may exceed the number of awards indicated provided the aggregate dollar amount is not exceeded.

Our purpose here is to make certain that in achieving financial savings, if limitation in these sports is approved, we do not severely limit participation by as many students as possible and do not create a serious runoff situation, that we feel is inherent in the legislation presented in No. 42, in those sports other than football and basketball.

[Proposal No. 117 (page A-65) was approved by a show of hands.]

[Proposal No. 42 (page A-21) for sports other than football and basketball was approved as amended by a show of hands.]

Financial Aid

President Ramer: Gentlemen, we come now to Proposal No. 45, a proposal concerning Financial Aid. I will ask Bill Flynn of Boston College to present this proposal.

William Flynn (Boston College): Mr. President, I move a change of Constitution amendments to Article 3, Section 4-(b).

[The motion was seconded.]

Alan J. Chapman (Rice University): Mr. President, I would like to move the adoption of Amendment No. 118.

President Ramer: There is a motion to amend by presenting No. 118.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Chapman: This merely editorially eliminates the reference to membership division.

[Proposal No. 118 (page A-66) was approved by a show of hands.]

[Proposal No. 45 (page A-24) was approved as amended 234-96.]

Determination of Financial Need

President Ramer: Now we face No. 46, and the Chair once again will recognize Wade Stinson of the University of Kansas.

Wade Stinson (University of Kansas): Mr. President, Item No. 46. Add a new Bylaw 5, Section 2.

[The motion was seconded.]

Gentlemen, this amendment merely establishes the procedure for awarding financial aid on the basis of the individual recipient's need.

Robert D. Karnes (Drake University): I would like to propose an amendment to Proposal No. 46. It is Proposal 47 of the Bylaws. This is to—well, the bold type explains it. I do so urge that this be amended.

President Ramer: All right. This is proposed as Amendment No. 47.

[The motion was seconded.]

The motion has been made and seconded. We are now discussing Item 47 which will amend Proposal No. 46, which we just moved. Now discussion.

Mr. Karnes: Mr. Chairman, the Council has taken into account the fact there is a difference in the tuition cost at the various member institutions when they made their original proposal. This amendment to that proposal takes into account there is as much as \$700 difference between the member schools in the cost of board and room. This proposal is designed to eliminate that difference.

Mr. Stinson: I urge this group to oppose this amendment. It is very possible it could end up where there would be no need established whatsoever. You could defeat the whole purpose of the need legislation.

[Proposal No. 47 (page A-26) was defeated by a show of hands.]

Edward M. Bennett (Washington State University): I rise to support that motion with the advice, consent and encouragement of my university president. I urge your support on the basis of decisions that I think we have been avoiding over a long period of time. At Miami we had the opportunity to consider this earlier. I looked at the people on the floor who told me earlier that their presidents were in favor of such a motion and then watched them vote against it. This time I think they had better represent their institutions, as I will.

Joseph H. Ruetz (Stanford University): I rise to urge the support of this particular legislation. I might preface my remarks by saying that while there are undoubtedly cost factors, I am not certain they are the most important issues we should look at; nor do I think the issue of private versus public universities is the most important issue.

It seems to me that what we are facing is the problem of equity in scholarship aid awarded within individual institutions that has no basis whatever on whether one has scholarship aid based on need and another does not.

I think it is very important we work on some assumptions. There are certain assumptions that work on athletic scholarships. One is that all student-athletes apparently are assumed to be in full financial need. I think this is something, if you study it, you will find it is not true.

Second, there is an assumption also that athletic scholarships are based on talent. While there are other talent scholarships in the university, they are never given out as indiscriminately in terms of total numbers as on the athletic front.

There are several talents connected with scholarships in the university, and many students and faculty are taking a very long look

at them. You are finding, No. 1, that scholarships in athletics are class-oriented, in a sense. All athletic students are given room, board and books in some institutions. Another student who may have great talent but whose parents can make some contribution toward his education is forced to pay some sort of a financial award to the university in order for him to be educated.

It appears that many students are looking at this, and the faculty are looking at this particular inequity with a very cold eye. It is something we should take into consideration.

There are several concerns that have been expressed by members of my conference when I discussed this particular subject. One was the problem of talent scholarships. They say talent scholarships are given in many other areas of the university in addition to athletics. I think this is true. There would be a strong argument for having scholarships for athletic students if indeed in other areas, in other talents, these awards were broadcast over the whole spectrum of talents whether it be band members, creative writing or whatever it may be. It appears to me other talents are more selectively looked at than they are in the athletic field.

A second argument raised is that football in particular is income-producing and student-athletes who are out on the football field should in essence be paid for the income they produce. In a sense this is something like unrelated business income. My personal feeling is that an athlete, if he has any value at all in the university, is under the total university umbrella; and as a student-athlete, he is not only there because he has talent and because people are watching his talent but also because he is representing the university.

There is a third concern, and I think this is a deep concern on the part of several faculties. Allowing a waiver of tuition on all fronts would give an enormous advantage to the private school. I think this is a genuine concern on the part of the faculty, and I would like to speak on it briefly.

No. 1. It appears to me the cost of education of the student-athlete, both in public and private schools, while it may vary in different areas of the country, is generally the same if you look at all of the cost. While in the public school the costs are not charged against the student by tuition either by state rule or by however they want to do it. In a sense it costs just as much to educate a student at the University of California as it does at Stanford University, but we show the cost of our tuition while the University of California does not. So in essence the public school has a waiver of this particular cost whereas the private school has not a waiver of the tuition. It seems to me it makes some sense if that logic is provable and acceptable.

Finally, there is a concern, and this may be a genuine concern, that some students may use this to divorce themselves in a sense from their parents. They may be cheating, in that coaches will talk to the parents and say, "Why doesn't the student in a sense divorce himself from his parents and claim he is independent and therefore, qualify for financial aid on the basis of need?" I am sure many schools using the need factor are facing this problem in one way or another. I would hate to think any coach or athletic director would encourage this on the part of his faculty.

Fourth, there has been concern about the drop in the quality of the

program. I believe, quite frankly, that the youngsters participate because there is an innate willingness to want to compete, and it is not based on the dollar sign.

I think there are a number of issues here, and I wanted to raise them.

J. William Davis (Texas Technological University): Mr. President, I am really not going to say much except that I do not want this to pass simply by acquiescence and quietness. I think a good many of the members of this convention know that I have opposed it for several years. I continue to oppose it. I wanted to have at least a measure of opposition expressed on the floor of this convention before a vote was taken.

I think all the reasons for opposition to this are still valid reasons, and I would hate to see this Convention adopt this very far-reaching and what I think is a very drastic change in our past athletic procedures.

That is all I will say at this point, Mr. President.

Rev. Edmund P. Joyce (University of Notre Dame): Mr. President, I am moved to come to this rostrum at the suggestion of Bill Davis. I, too, would not like to see this passed, as I suspect it is going to be, without serious consideration being given to the impact of this change.

I think this is an example where the schools represented at this convention differ somewhat in their problems. This is one of the areas I think that calls for reorganization that we discussed earlier. I say this because I am well aware that there are many institutions who are really not interested in athletic grants-in-aid at all. They prefer working without these. There are others who philosophically would like to distribute their resources among a large number of youngsters. I am in full accord with these objectives.

At the same time in the practical world in which we live, for those institutions that really have major programs in football and in basketball, the problem in these two particular sports is largely a problem of recruiting fairly and squarely with each other.

There were times, maybe 10 or 15 years ago, when there was a great deal of sentiment opposed to athletic grants-in-aid. There was sentiment among many of these institutions that there should be no such thing, that we should not distinguish between an athlete and another scholar. There still is prevalent, I believe, in many of our institutions among our faculties the thought that athletes should not receive any kind of preference treatment in the way of grants-in-aid. They seem to feel that if you give an athlete some help, you are depriving some other boy who might do much better in the classroom from this kind of assistance.

I think that is a fallacy because the sport of football, and to a lesser extent basketball, do generate the kind of income which permits you to give athletic grants-in-aid not only to these two sports but also to many of the other sports and helps carry on your entire program.

What do we get into when we get into recruiting for the blue-chip athletes? I think there is the problem faced today, by, say, 100 institutions. You get into the problem where the coaches are attempting, of course, to get the very best men they can; and one of the best things we have done in the past 15 years I think is to remove the under-the-table inducements, the additional financial inducements that used to be somewhat prevalent.

Now, I believe one of the reasons we have done this is by the recognition on the part of this body that a full grant-in-aid to an athlete is legitimate. It really does not detract from your scholarship program, and we shouldn't equate the scholarship program of the university with this particular problem in athletics.

I think this is a move backwards in the sense that there is going to be, I am afraid, a great deal of pressure on the part not just of coaches but of the enthusiastic alumni to get around this particular condition now, that is based on need. I say this for several reasons, not because I think they are dishonest but I think we are placing in front of them very grave temptations. I believe it is almost part and parcel of our national athletic scene today for these young men to expect a full ride for football and basketball. Again, I am referring to the blue-chip athletes and to their families. How we are going to counteract this and change this is an open question. I think it is going to be very, very difficult to do. So I think that temptation is going to be present.

Secondly, I think that the problem foreseen by many of the coaches who are in this recruiting race is the knowledge that no table devised by mankind is really going to be totally equitable in regard to the financial need of a particular family. It is almost impossible to get.

Furthermore—and I could enumerate any number of examples like this—I believe as a result of this the families are going to be encouraged to cheat a little bit. I think this is going to be unfortunate.

Because of that, I just foresee another sort of can of worms being opened; and I hope I am wrong. I don't think this thing was practical. I think theoretically it is good, but I know we are going to run into a great many problems. I believe as soon as you get into differentiation among your football players who are contributing to a first-rate program, you are getting into a moral problem where one boy is getting a certain amount of help and another boy a different amount based on the formulas given. If the formula is not equitable, doesn't work in particular instances, you have a great deal of dissatisfaction on the part of the student-athletes and on the part of the families.

All of these things I foresee as problems. The principal reason I think this has been advanced by the NCAA and the Council is on the basis of our financial problems. This is one way we can save money, and yet I don't actually believe you are going to save a great deal of money in this. I think many of the boys are still going to need financial assistance, and I think we are opening the door to all kinds of problems which may come to haunt us in the future.

Thomas Jacobs (University of California, Los Angeles): I would like to oppose this amendment more on the ground of what it will actually do to the athletic picture. I believe the cheating will be absolutely tremendous as a result of this.

In the ordinary awarding of financial aid, as it is done in our university by the financial officers, there are several factors that are very different from those that you encounter in the athletic picture. For one thing, the amount of the award that is available per student is very much smaller than in the ordinary case. The problem of the financial officer in trying to divide up this money is far less serious because he can take cases that are absolutely certain.

Now we have in the athletic picture an instance where the families are in the middle-income group, and the students feel they have been

discriminated against. In the past they have been on full aid, and there is little chance that the financial officer can be given this ability to discriminate. If all the father has to do to get his son full aid is to say, "I won't take him on my income tax," then the whole savings and the whole thing is gone. You will have cheating of all kinds.

In the ordinary granting of financial aid, it turns out that there are some checks that you can make; but there is always this factor of discrimination which can be made by the financial office successfully. I think this would be completely impossible.

I would submit, gentlemen, that in passing a financial need package of this sort we are doing just about the same thing that the country did when it passed the Prohibition Amendment. You had tremendous numbers of people who were against it, and it failed. It seems to me you have exactly the same kind of bootleg situation you are going to encounter here.

In the second place, I would like to speak for a minute about the difference between the public schools and the private schools. In general, the private institutions have the ability to limit class size, and this is important in any quality education. A thing that is so nearly destroying the public schools and the public institutions is this tremendous student-faculty ratio and the very large classes. I believe it is strictly correct to say that most middle-class families would believe that the quality of education is better at Stanford than it would be at UCLA or at Iowa or any place like that.

This is a real factor in terms of recruitment that your coaches are going to encounter.

It seems to me the athlete has very different factors involved in the financial aid he gets from those that are involved for the ordinary student.

I believe this is poor legislation, and we shouldn't pass it.

J. Lloyd Milam (University of Southern Mississippi): I speak as a matter of great conscience. My parents died when I was a small boy. My sister married a rich Texan. She was very eligible and eager to put me through college. The greatest experience in my life was to enter school, weighing 168 pounds, and play guard on an athletic scholarship. It is a matter of great satisfaction to the individual, whoever it may be.

I urge you defeat financial aid based on need.

E. McG. Hedgpeth (University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill): I rise to pay tribute and endorse completely from a personal standpoint all that Father Joyce has said. He expressed it better and more eloquently than I could. I think all that he said is true. I think he left a lot of things unsaid, that he could have said.

Some of us in this room remember what took place before the days of grant-in-aid. As I said on the floor in Hollywood last year, it took a black snake to follow the tracks of some of our people; and we encourage them in it. I think this is poor legislation. I think it is legislation that opens the door for many of the things I am sure this organization does not stand for and does not tolerate if it knows about them.

Incidentally, I want, as a point of personal privilege, to say that in the proceedings of last year's meeting I was misquoted. They said I said the grants-in-aid was the most dishonest thing we have ever

done. What I did say, and what I say now, is the grants-in-aid, as we know it today, is the most honest thing we have ever done. Thank you, sir.

Dick Youngburg (Brockport State University): I have a question to pose to the Council in this regard, in regard to (d) and (e). Specifically, in respect to the family contribution formula and also the form being used, are these consistent with federal regulations?

President Ramer: The question is: Are the provisions in (d) and (e) consistent with federal regulations?

Kenneth Victory (Stetson University): Mr. President, in attending a meeting yesterday, I asked this very question. Educational Amendment HEW 1972 sets out that several methods may be used in determining needs. It is our opinion that this would have to be approved in its present form it would not automatically be acceptable. The income tax form or CSA, it would have to be approved by the Office of Education, in our opinion. This is the question I asked, and we attended an HEW meeting in Atlanta about a week ago.

I would like to say a word about the independent student or emancipated student. It is a concern to HEW which has just limited it in the 1972 Amendment. It has been that the student could spend four months at home in a calendar year, and now he can only spend three weeks at home. Whether that will solve the situation I don't know, but three weeks is put in there. If it is longer than three weeks he is or may be assumed to have obtained \$200 or more, which eliminates him from the independent student or financial-aid student.

President Ramer: Does that answer your question?

Mr. Youngburg: Mr. Chairman, the reason I asked the question was more from the standpoint of financial aid in terms of our various campuses. I think unless the NCAA adopts a type of constituted formula that is consistent with federal regulations, there is going to be unnecessary duplication with the financial aid offices. I would like to see the type of thing we are doing with the NCAA consistent with those federal regulations. Otherwise you will have the financial aid offices of the institutions putting together two different types of need packages, one of those who are involved with athletics and one for those who are not.

I would urge the Council to reconsider both the formula that is presented and the form that is presented and perhaps attach a rider policy to this proposal as it now exists stating that the Council in the interim would attempt to make these consistent so we do not have to have the unnecessary duplication.

I think this is a case, you might say, the NCAA is re-inventing the wheel. The machinery is already there. It has been provided by government regulations, but we come up with a different formula for determining needs.

Jack Davis (Oregon State University): Mr. Bennett indicated the preference of his president. I feel compelled to do the same for mine. My president asked me to vote against this amendment for several reasons. Let me relate to you what my president reported to me.

He feels that in reality we ask most our athletes to do many more things than we do some of our other students, even some graduate students; and we restrict them to a considerable extent.

We ask the students in football, for example, to return to school

early, thus reducing some of the summer employment they would have an opportunity for otherwise.

My president raised the question of constitutionality. Let me just give you an example here. He said if the financial need table would show a student could receive, say \$200 from his institution and the rest come from his parents, would it be constitutionally correct to prevent that student from earning additional finances with a part-time job as can all other students who are on similar scholarships and the university?

Those questions were raised by my president.

In addition, I would say the question of the emancipated student is a very real one. I would urge the Convention, in view of some of these unanswered questions and the difficulties associated with relating to the students, particularly the difficulty of our institution relating to the student and his parents with regard to this emancipation problem, to defer action on this amendment until such time that we might consider reorganization or some other way of reducing costs.

Henry T. Lowe (University of Missouri, Columbia): With regard to the emancipated student, I would ask the delegates to observe one fact that has been brought out so far. Under the laws of many states today, a student becomes emancipated at 18. I think this is a movement that will increase in the near future; and as that movement increases, I think the application of the proposal that is before this convention, the even application among institutions, will become increasingly difficult.

[Proposal No. 46 (page A-25) was defeated by a show of hands.]
[Short recess]

Motion to Reconsider No. 15

John O. Roning (Big Sky Athletic Conference): Mr. President, would we be out of order at this time to ask for a reconsideration now of the voting on Item 15, or reorganization, now that the voting on financial aid has been completed?

President Ramer: Are you making that as a motion?

Mr. Roning: If it is in order, I would like to do so.

President Ramer: Motion is made to reconsider Item No. 15. Gentlemen, a motion to reconsider, as I understand it, is appropriate at any time during the convention, and the Chair honors the motion as made.

[The motion was seconded.]

George Bisacca (Eastern College Athletic Conference): Point of order!

Edward S. Betz (University of the Pacific): Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. Did the gentleman who made the motion to reconsider vote on the prevailing side?

Mr. Bisacca: We have no way under ECAC, under our method of voting here, to determine who voted on the prevailing side and who did not. For that reason we feel the motion is out of order.

President Ramer: I will turn to our parliamentarian, Dr. Marcus Plant, and ask him to assist us at this time. Mr. Bisacca, of the ECAC, has stated that the motion to reconsider is out of order.

Marcus Plant (University of Michigan): I would rule that in a meeting as large as this, where it is not possible to determine how people have voted on a given motion, as opposed to a small closed meeting,

it is in order for anyone to make the motion to reconsider. I am an authority on Sturgis, and there are other sources for the same.

Mr. Bisacca: You have ruled.

We feel on the merits of the motion that it is improper and very prejudicial to some of the members who may have left already to raise a motion at this time.

Mr. Cross made a statement earlier that the voting on the various items which just took place was not tied into reorganization. I believe many members here voted on that basis. If we now allow passage of No. 15, it would be a very simple matter once again to get us back to the reorganizational setup that was proposed and to bring us right back to the things we voted against.

Certainly the motion to reconsider can be voted on; but I think if we allow it to be tied in after the vote on these other issues has taken place, you will be denying the voice of the membership which was expressed the other day against the type of organization that was proposed.

William Davis (Texas Technological Institute): First, I was going to ask you: Is the motion before us to reconsider?

President Ramer: Yes.

Mr. Davis: I would like to make a brief appeal against that. I was for the reorganization, but I think we had a fair and square vote on it. I am willing to take the consequences. I ain't scared of anybody. I don't think anybody is scared of me. I think we can live under this tent very well, as we have done for a number of years. If we want to bring it up next year properly, let's bring it up next year properly; but I don't like the idea of voting one way today to do something and voting the next day to reconsider.

I would urge, let's vote against reconsideration. [Applause]

President Ramer: I am moved to comment, if anyone harbors the thought that there is Council conspiracy in this matter, Dr. Davis's allegation here should remove that from the thinking immediately.

Mr. Roning: The reason I brought it up is there was a hangup between the College Division and the voting on financial aid. Now that has been settled. That is the reason it was brought up at this time. I know the Big Sky Conference voted unanimously for reorganization.

Mr. Bisacca: I think there is one other problem. We indicated to the membership before they came out here that voting on reorganization would take place on Friday, and if it were passed, voting on specifics would take place on Saturday. There was no indication that reorganization would be voted today. It was possible yesterday to make this motion. It was also possible to bring up No. 16, which would have accomplished reorganization in another fashion.

I can visualize a member who was here yesterday voting against reorganization, going home, picking up the paper tomorrow and finding out that he is stuck with it.

C. D. Henry (Grambling College): I was one of the ones speaking for a vote on financial need before we moved to reorganization. Because I did not know how it would come out, I did feel if we did vote on financial need first it would certainly be defeated.

I want to state again what I said both at the round table and yesterday. As far as I am concerned and one of the groups I was representing, we have no argument against reorganization as long as we

have the same financial need, 1,600 legislation and the umbrella on constitutional matters.

So I would at least want this in the record. Although I did hear Dr. Davis, when we went to the District 6 caucus yesterday morning, those of us who came from Division 2 schools voted we would be against reorganization unless we voted on financial aid first. Then after we did vote on aid, in that same caucus we showed that we did want reorganization. I would want this Convention to know how those of us in the smaller schools felt.

[Motion to reconsider No. 15 (page A-7) was defeated by a show of hands.]

Candidate's Acceptance Form

President Ramer: We move now to Proposal No. 48. I will ask Dr. Ralph Fadum of North Carolina State University to present this.

David Swank (University of Oklahoma): Mr. President, since the proposal on need, the Bylaw proposal, No. 46, failed, I hate to ask for another reconsideration; but it seems possibly we should reconsider Item No. 45 which was the constitutional basis for the need formula. So I would move to reconsider No. 45 at this time.

I don't think there is any unfairness here. I hope no one left in the few minutes intervening.

President Ramer: You have heard the motion to reconsider Item No. 45. Is there a second?

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Swank: To be very brief, since we defeated No. 46, why not remove the constitutional provision allowing for implementation of need?

[Motion to reconsider No. 45 was defeated by a show of hands.]

Ralph Fadum (North Carolina State University): Mr. President, on behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of the amendment to Article 1, Section 1 of the Bylaws, as set forth in Proposal No. 48.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. President and members of the Association: In brief, it is the purpose of this amendment to establish procedures for the issuance and return of acceptance forms by prospective student-athletes; and it is to this end that the amendment provides rules for specific implementation of procedures to insure that all member institutions honor a candidate's commitment. Penalties for violations of agreements are provided for, and relief to accommodate deviations that arise from extenuating circumstances is also provided for.

Seaver Peters (Dartmouth College): As did Father Joyce and other previous speakers, I, too, plead for understanding of the impact of legislation on institutions of differing philosophies. I oppose this legislation because I believe it is tainted with professional overtones and comparable to the reserve clause now existing in professional athletics.

In addition, I think the fairness of imposing a burden of such irreversible decision on an impressionable young man of approximately 18 years of age, who is subject to high pressure and many times exclusively a recruiter, is questionable when applied on a national basis.

I believe a student's right to participate and to receive financial aid at a second institution is severely curtailed after he has signed an acceptance form with the initial institution.

For instance, if a young man signs with Institution A and then perhaps spends a summer in Cap Cod, Massachusetts in oceanographic study, he might well decide he would like to change the discipline which he chose to pursue in college. If the institution with which he is signed does not offer that discipline, he is locked into that institution; or if he wishes to change, he forfeits perhaps financial aid, but indeed two years of varsity eligibility.

Legally, I heard several speakers refer to constitutional aspects. I think, legally, enforceability, especially at state universities who are obligated to provide equal opportunities for participation, is certainly questionable.

I also think the following programs are jeopardized, at the very least are rendered less effective: early decision programs and programs of rolling admission.

Many institutions become involved in a waiting list.

I think the effectiveness of that or the fairness of that would be severely limited.

Hundreds of institutions abide by the candidate's reply date. This would be delayed by at least two weeks, which again would render the waiting list two weeks late and therefore, would be unfair to those awaiting a decision from an institution which they might prefer to attend.

The proposal indicates that you need not modify procedures. You better had if you choose to be competitive.

An example might be an institution that presently abides by a mid-April notification date. It will certainly not be competitive for the fall-sport athletes because they have been offered a grant for acceptance in early March. Clearly, the young man interested in participation in fall sports would choose the bird in the hand rather than wait for a month or a month and a half to hear from an institution which might well turn him down. But, the man might well prefer to attend this institution if the notification is favorable.

So I think on the one hand, the March-April conflict, and on the other hand, the waiting list—roughly, I think 20 sports would not be notified until, as I recall, the Friday closest to May 1. The candidate's reply date is May 1. I reiterate, hundreds of institutions abide by that date. You are asking them to send a second notification. The date could conceivably be as late as May 13; and those on the waiting list, I repeat, have to wait that much longer.

Some of us have independent and indeed omnipotent boards of admissions. I am sure all of you can appreciate the fact that an athletic department, and indeed in my opinion an athletic organization, should not be attempting to dictate admissions procedures.

I urge the defeat of proposal No. 48, the Candidate's Acceptance Form.

Harry Cross (University of Washington): Mr. President, Mr. Peters has made some serious misstatements, inadvertently I am sure.

The problem of the candidate's acceptance as regards athletic participation is disassociated from the admissions program. Certainly if an institution had an earlier admission program and the youngster said he was going there, the likelihood of his signing an acceptance with some other institution would be small. Of course, if this institution decided to use this acceptance procedure program, which it is not

required to do, you would have to send it at a later date.

As to the youngster being forced to go into oceanography or forestry, there are provisions in this proposal to accommodate any legitimate change of institution for an academic reason; and it is purposely there to insulate the youngster from that kind of determination.

On the other hand, this procedure does minimize the likelihood of constant raiding of youngsters, who in fact have made up their minds where they wish to go, by athletic recruiters of other institutions.

I would say that there is an oversight as regards whether the release would be essentially automatic. Certainly the language is intended to make it that, and I believe it would be.

As regards the persuasion of the youngster, who once decided to go to Institution A, to accept an invitation to Institution B and attend their athletic program, there is a purposeful part of this program that during the quiet period recruiting is illegal. If the various institutions which wish him to attend or participate in their sports programs have made their case by the time of the mailing, not the hand delivery but the mailing of the invitation to participate in the program, there is a period of time purposely provided here that the youngster can make up his mind and make, therefore, a more likely, purposeful and sound decision as to what institution he will attend. Having made that, the other institutions are by this procedure expected and obligated not to try to interfere with that determination.

I think some of the concerns that Seaver mentions are misstated. Some of them are excessive. I urge that this be accepted by the Convention.

[Proposal No. 48 (page A-27) was defeated by a show of hands.]

Employment of Coaches

President Ramer: We have come now to No. 49.

William Davis (Texas Technological University): Mr. President, will you please excuse me for this, but I purposely took no part in the argument pro or con. I simply want to announce that the voluntary letter of intent proposes to continue, and those of you who desire to participate need to get in touch with me within the next two weeks.

President Ramer: Thank you, Mr. Davis. Mr. Davis, as you know, has worked through the years with representatives of our Association in the development of the voluntary letter of intent; and he commends your continuing attention to that arrangement.

All right. No. 49, Employment of Coaches. The Chair recognizes Mr. Wayne Duke, Big Ten Commissioner.

Wayne Duke (Big Ten Commissioner): Mr. President, on behalf of the several conferences listed as the source of Proposal No. 49, I move the adoption of enabling legislation set forth under No. 49 to permit for the principle governing the employment of coaches.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. President, over the past year a number of the so-called major athletic conferences of the nation have conducted a series of meetings relative to the financial crisis facing higher education, particularly as related to the conduct of the intercollegiate athletic program. These meetings have included university presidents, faculty representatives, directors of athletics and college conference commissioners of eleven conferences, formally known as the Collegiate Commissioners Association.

In addition, several other meetings of the Collegiate Commissioners Association have been conducted to view ways and means of effecting the cost saving features in the operation of our athletic programs.

While we recognize certain inherent problems in the proposal to establish limitation on the size of the football coaching staff, it was with the view in mind of acting in concert with the possibility of limitation on the number of athletic grants that considerable savings might be effected by placing a limitation on the size of the coaching staffs. It is with that view in mind that this proposal is before the Convention today.

Homer Rice (University of North Carolina): I am not speaking for the big staffs.

Personally, I oppose the limitation of the coaching staffs as written. I came up through the coaching staff. Many of our administrators have. Had there been limitations of this kind when I started, I perhaps would not be in the position I am in today.

I have a strong feeling the college coaching profession, if we limit the number, if we fix it at this time, we are going to turn away many qualified coaches. Either they will never get in, they will be let out, or they will by-pass us—pardon the expression—for the professional ranks.

I believe this is the individual institution's problem, and only they should be in position to determine their needs or their control of this situation. It should be left in the institution's hands, as all departments in the individual institutions are.

We need to encourage the qualified young men into the college coaching profession, not discourage them.

Wiles Hallock (Pacific-8 Conference): Mr. Chairman, while recognizing the point that Homer Rice has made, I should like to join my colleague, Mr. Duke, in supporting this proposal, again calling your attention to those conferences which by majority action are in support of it. The Pacific-8 Conference was not unanimous on this issue, but perhaps two or three members of the conference only are in excess of this limitation at the present time.

I urge your support of this proposition.

Charles M. Neinas (Big Eight Conference): Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in opposition to No. 49. I find myself in somewhat of a strange situation, following my two esteemed colleagues, Mr. Duke and Mr. Hallock, who spoke in favor of it.

You will notice under No. 50 the Big Eight Conference was listed as a sponsor of the limitation on basketball. As a matter of fact, the Big Eight Conference does have a staff limitation on basketball, as the item listed in Section 2 of No. 50. We arrived at this decision based on the fact that none of our institutions employ more than three full-time and one part-time student assistant.

Our presidents are concerned about the escalating cost of intercollegiate athletics, the same as the other conferences' institutional presidents. However, a number of questions have been raised, when you come to limiting staffs and have coaches in excess of the number presented.

We, within the Big Eight Conference, are trying to come to some equitable limitation to the coaching staffs. So far we have been unable

to satisfactorily answer a number of questions that have been posed as to how you can reduce to that limit.

For example, if you have more than eight and this legislation passes, what is the effective date as to which you must reach the total number of eight full-time coaches? How do you go about reducing your staff to meet the number eight?

The suggestion has been made that you do it through attrition. Frequently the assistant coach you will lose is your offensive or defensive coordinator who goes to become head coach in another institution. Therefore, you are unable to replace one of your key assistants.

Inasmuch as there are so many unanswered questions, I would ask your opposition to No. 49.

J. D. Morgan (University of California, Los Angeles): I also find myself in a very unusual position. Maybe I should transfer to the Big Eight. I support Mr. Neinas's remarks made here. I am in opposition to No. 49.

I do believe in the economy measures that we have been trying to institute, those in recruiting; and I thought perhaps the last amendment that we just defeated, the Candidate's Acceptance Form, might have some savings in it. But when you get down to talking about the personnel in a department, why not assistant athletic directors, why not the people in the corporate office, why not the secretaries? Are they all needed? Why just coaches?

Football and basketball are the two income sports that we have in order to carry on our full program at UCLA. I think this should be an institutional responsibility, and your chancellor or your president should charge your athletic director to operate his program to the best of his ability to make it at least break even. If he decides that he cannot afford the coaching staff that he has, then he makes the decision, not the national regulatory body.

Joseph H. Ruetz (Stanford University): Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the motion. I don't think athletics is the only one facing this problem in the university. I know chemistry departments and others are being asked not to hire new crews because of the costs they are facing.

I think, secondly, when you look at football particularly—I suspect probably more than any other place—you are facing probably the most costly effort in the university in relation to the number of coaches to the number of people you are teaching. Individual seminars on the ratio of one-to-eight faculty are an expensive way of teaching, and athletics is really set up this way in this high-pressure sport like football. I think there is some possibility of saving because most of your costs are connected with personnel.

I rise in support of this particular resolution and ask that you approve it.

[Proposal No. 49 (page A-31) was defeated by a show of hands.]

1.600 Rule

President Ramer: Now under the reordering of yesterday afternoon, we move to the consideration of No. 75.

Jess Hill (Pacific Coast Athletic Association): Mr. President, if it would be in order, before we consider No. 75, I would like a ruling from the Chair or the parliamentarian as to what happens to the

proposals following Proposal No. 75. I am speaking specifically, what happens to Proposals No. 76 and No. 77 in the event that the 1.600 is eliminated.

President Ramer: Thank you Jesse. I would call upon our parliamentarian, Dr. Marcus Plant, to respond to this question. What happens to succeeding Proposals 76, 77 and so on after action on 75.

Mr. Plant: Mr. President, there are a number of reasons why a faculty representative invited to be parliamentarian at the convention should, if he is a man of judgment and prudence, decline the opportunity. [Laughter] But by far the greatest reason is the problem that is presented by this kind of arrangement of the agenda. We have had it before, as you will recall, for several years.

Yesterday I gave consideration to the question that was raised, and I reached the conclusion for the moment that even though No. 75 was passed, the following measures would be in order; but in an exchange of views with our good friend, Mr. Casale, last evening, while I still maintained that position for a time, it wouldn't leave me. I thought about it a great deal. It seems to me now that if No. 75 passes, the paragraph (b) of Article 4, Section 6 is completely gone.

If we were to consider No. 76, for example, which purports to amend paragraph (b) it would be amending a nonexistent paragraph; and we would have a group of dangling clauses consisting of those that are in the black print.

I have changed my mind, Ernie, subject to your persuasion; and it seems to me the answer to Mr. Hill's question is that if 75 passes then No. 76, No. 77, and the following resolutions that relate to that paragraph (b), as purporting to amend it, are not properly before the Convention.

There are several alternatives. Perhaps one is to seek a change in the agenda. Under the Chairman's ruling yesterday it would be by a two-thirds vote. You could change No. 75 to be the last measure to be voted upon, after the amending process had been completed. Thus, if it is the will of the Convention—that is not a parliamentary ruling—the Convention would have the opportunity to see to what degree the 1.600 paragraph can be perfected; and then in the end determine if we want it at all. This is one procedure.

There are some other parliamentary procedures that could be followed; but in view of the ruling of the Chair yesterday, it seems to me that the postponing of the agenda is the first one before us. Perhaps other people have some other notions as to how we should proceed; but it seems to me, in answer to your question, Mr. Hill, if No. 75 passes there is nothing to amend in the following provisions.

President Ramer: The Chair would accept that ruling that in the event of the approval of No. 75, subsequent amendments 76 through 85 would just be out of order.

Mr. Hill: We had intended to present an amendment to try to cover this situation; and at that time we were advised that these other proposals, regardless of what happened to the 1.600 legislation, would have an opportunity on the floor of this convention. The time is past now, relative to submitting an amendment. We felt, when we submitted this, that we wanted it heard and voted upon, regardless of what happened to the 1.600 legislation. In effect this does eliminate 1.600, but essentially it was submitted to establish an academic floor

relative to academic eligibility for financial aid for practice and for competition. If we vote out the 1.600 legislation, we are left without anything.

That may be what some institutions wish. Now, is there any way that the parliamentarian can rule that we challenge the ruling of the parliamentarian?

President Ramer: Yes, an appeal to the convention floor with a two-thirds vote. Am I correct in that, Marc? It would be an appeal of the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. Hill: Mr. President, I would like to move a re-order of the numbering of these proposals. I would like to move that No. 76, No. 77 and the other proposals be considered prior to the consideration of Proposal No. 75.

President Ramer: Thank you, Mr. Hill. This will be comparable to reordering the proposals treated yesterday; that is, as they are presented to the convention floor.

[The motion was seconded.]

Now we are discussing the motion to reorder, to give our consideration first to this item No. 76, moving on through those, and treating finally No. 75. The motion has been seconded, and we are now discussing the motion to reorder.

Robert J. Tierney (Queens College): I would like to speak against this motion. It has always been my understanding—and I have attended a number of NCAA conventions—that any amendment which is considered to be most restrictive is always considered first. I submit that Amendment No. 75 is the most restrictive amendment and, therefore, should be so considered. For that reason I would urge that you vote against this motion.

[Motion to revise the agenda was defeated by a show of hands.]

Mr. Hill: Mr. President, in an appeal of the ruling of the Chair and the parliamentarian, would such an appeal call for a two-thirds majority or a majority?

President Ramer: Our parliamentarian says a majority vote.

Mr. Hill: Mr. Chairman, I appeal the ruling of the parliamentarian regarding the decision as to the order of consideration of these proposed items.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Hill: We would like to have the original decision that they would all be heard. We would like to appeal the decision so that all proposed items regarding 1.600 legislation would be heard.

President Ramer: All right. This appeal has been made, and there has been a second. We are now discussing this. This is an appeal to overturn the decision of the Chair in regard to sequence.

George Bisacca (Eastern College Athletic Conference): Just for clarification, as the appeal is directed it seems to me there is a little ambiguity. We just had a motion to suspend the rules, which was voted on and defeated. Now it seems to me Mr. Hill's request goes to the decision of the parliamentarian and the Chair, that the order be changed.

President Ramer: No, George.

Mr. Bisacca: They will all be considered, regardless of what happens to No. 75?

President Ramer: We would still have the sequence with No. 75

first; but if the appeal from the Chair's decision is sustained, we would give attention to No. 76 and the subsequent proposals after our consideration of No. 75.

Mr. Bisacca: Then what is being appealed? I am trying to clarify it. I am lost. Then what is being appealed is Marc's ruling, in which he indicated, after talking to Ernie, that if No. 75 were passed there would be no paragraphs (b), (c), (d) and so forth. He is appealing from that specific ruling of the Chair.

President Ramer: That is my understanding, George, illustrating that, if No. 75 passes, we are still in position to consider No. 76 and subsequent motions. If No. 75 is defeated, we are still in position to consider No. 76 and No. 77. I think that was Mr. Hill's point, that we need an opportunity on the convention floor, in the event of the defeat of the 1.600, to give attention to other kinds of standards. They would not be 1.600 standards; they would be other kinds of standards.

Mr. Bisacca: Therefore, I would assume also that any necessary amendments to make the proposed amendments compatible—I am talking about technical amendments in the wording because of the absence of paragraph (b)—would be later supplied. Is that it? Right now, if you put it the way it is, it wouldn't fit.

President Ramer: Exactly.

Wendell Basye (University of Oregon): I would like to support the motion to appeal from the ruling of the parliamentarian on two grounds.

One, it seems that we were a bit mouse-trapped in our district meeting, having been informed by a member of the Council that the tentative ruling was that the matters would be taken up.

It seems to me, Dr. Plant, that the second point I could make is if you can change your mind that easily after discussion with people, we can change our language and the bold-faced type in our Proposal No. 76 or Proposal No. 77. Instead of leaving it in just plain Romans we can make it bold-faced type and have the entire subparagraph (b) still in existence and meet your argument that for that purpose only, we cannot take the matters and pass No. 75 and not go on to No. 76 and No. 77.

[Motion to overturn the ruling of the Chair was approved 200-175.]

President Ramer: Is there someone to propose Item No. 75?

Robert J. Tierney (Queens College): I move the approval of Proposal No. 75 of the Bylaws to amend Article 4, Section 6, by deleting paragraphs (b), (c), (d) and all applicable interpretations.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, there have been many proposals concerning 1.600 legislation for the past several years. It is my opinion that none of them will work or do work. I have argued against that many times. I point out again, it is a violation of institutional autonomy. It violates self-determination. It discriminates against certain types of students. In many institutions they are accepted as matriculated students, and yet we find that they are ineligible because they cannot meet a certain index.

I might point out that there is nothing circumspect about that. It would be suspect in my book as to whether some of the indices given by high schools or colleges would be true of individual capabilities or not.

I think there is some credence to the fact that many secondary schools would not cooperate to the fullest extent in this kind of venture. I should like to point out also that it has always been my interpretation that the NCAA is concerned with eligibility for championships. Yet we find that this 1.600 legislation that we are concerning ourselves with is rather on in-season eligibility. I think this is wrong.

I firmly believe the time has come, not to study or attack this problem piecemeal, but to take the bull by the horns and wipe it off the books.

Alan Chapman (Rice University): I would like to speak in opposition to the motion, not on behalf of the Council and the Committee on Academic Testing and Requirements.

I think it would be a serious mistake for this Association to remove any academic standards at all; and when one couples that with the present freshman eligibility rule, the opportunities for the abuse of the young man grow enormously. There are marginal students with high athletic ability, and there are coaches and programs that will go after those boys. They will be damaged seriously if we abolish all standards and keep the freshman rule.

William E. Leckie (Colorado School of Mines): I think I will return to my favorite subject. Last year I suggested that rather than further confuse the rule with a lot of changes, we sit with the darned thing until we can get it out of the Bylaws provision that it is under and get it into the Constitution in simple language, where it belongs.

A member of the Council came back and said, "Mr. Chairman, I agree completely with the last statement. One time I endeavored to do that very thing. The Eligibility Committee is more confused on this than anybody." And then there are more words.

I am convinced that the statement still stands from my side and from Mr. Davis's side. I urge the defeat of this motion. I think we certainly cannot retreat from academic standards in this Association. We listened to the two young men who spoke to us yesterday and who coupled the two things together.

I do believe that moving this to the Constitution is the proper thing to do. I assure you that next year I will have a proposal that will be simple and sweet and understandable. In the meantime, please defeat this and possibly all these other things.

Robert Behrman (City College of New York): I hope there will be a final plea for the abolition of a regulation which time has shown to be a source of confusion, embarrassment, frustration and hostility for ever-increasing numbers of member institutions.

I feel it is discriminatory in every sense of the word. At many of the member institutions new criteria for admissions have been developed which for many students preclude the necessity for taking admissions examinations, therefore making conformance with the regulation an impossibility.

The regulation has evoked considerable consternation and antagonism—unfortunately directed toward the NCAA—running the gamut from students and college presidents to Congressmen.

I do not intend at this time to grind the axe of my institution or elaborate on the uniqueness of our program. Instead, I would point out that we are certainly not alone relative to our opposition to

Bylaw 4-6-(b). I know many others oppose it as well for a multitude of reasons. There are 11 proposals before us which express nationwide concern with this unsatisfactory and unwieldy piece of legislation.

Gentlemen, with a view in mind toward not beating a dead horse—many of us have sat through 1.600 discussions for years—I will conclude my plea. I would finally urge that we make a clean break. Let's end the hassling, the embarrassment, the inequities, the unfairness and the administrative complexities which relate to the rule. On the other hand, let's enhance the image of our organization by voting to abolish 1.600 once and for all.

[Proposal No. 75 (page A-42) was approved 204-187.]

Father Crowley (West Coast Athletic Conference): If this vote prevails, there is an editorial change, No. 75 to No. 92 I think it would be, to amend new Article 4 instead of an amendment. Could that be accepted as an editorial change? Then I have another question.

President Ramer: Our parliamentary rules that this has passed as written, and we should not make that change editorially.

Father Crowley: Another question for the parliamentarian. Is there another item, Other Business? Can these proposals be placed there? If not, why not?

President Ramer: You mean a re-examination of these, Father Crowley? These are to be considered in sequence now, Father Crowley.

Father Crowley: Okay.

President Ramer: I am about to think of our recessing time here. We have almost 12 o'clock. Is there any objection to recessing at this time?

[The Convention recessed at 11:55 a.m.]

BUSINESS SESSION

Saturday Afternoon, January 13, 1973

The Convention reconvened at 1:35 p.m., President Ramer presiding.

15. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

No. 75 Effective Immediately

Richard A. Young (Bowling Green State University): I would like to move that the legislation passed this morning, in particular Amendment No. 75 and possibly any other amendment relating to the 1.600 rule, be effective immediately.

President Ramer: Thank you, sir. The motion is in order.

[The motion was seconded.]

[Motion was approved by a show of hands.]

1.600 Rule

President Ramer: We move now to Item 76. The Chair recognizes Jack Davis, of Oregon State University.

Jack Davis (Oregon State University): Mr. Chairman, on behalf of Pacific-8 Conference, I move the adoption of Item No. 76 to amend Bylaw 4, Section 6.

President Ramer: Thank you, Mr. Davis. Is there a second?

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of giving this convention an opportunity to select the best of the following items in the agenda and to avoid the problem of having nothing considered because of the problems in between sections, I move that the question be divided into three separate sections.

President Ramer: You have heard the motion to divide the question.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Davis: I might also mention, Mr. Chairman, giving my reason for doing this, that this would be done with the understanding also that Item No. 77 is to be proposed for division.

President Ramer: Yes, that will be proposed, but approval of the division for 77 would not be considered at this time. That is clear I think.

[Motion to divide question was approved by a show of hands.]

Mr. Walberg (University of Illinois, Chicago): Point of order, Mr. Chairman. I raise the question, with the rules that cannot come on the books any longer, how we can discuss it at this point. Only the bold-face print may be amended or acted upon at this convention. Isn't that correct?

President Ramer: There is a provision, proposing the establishment of an academic standard beyond 1.600 legislation.

Mr. Walberg: I was directing the question relative to what we are actually amending.

President Ramer: The amendment relates to Proposal No. 76 of the Bylaws, I mean No. 76 of the proposals.

Mr. Walberg: Proposal No. 76 is amending what was just deleted to be effective immediately from the Constitution. Isn't that correct?

President Ramer: The convention decided this morning—we discussed this at some length—that we would proceed with these after treatment of No. 75. The Chair is basing his decision here upon that agreement reached this morning.

Mr. Davis: I presume then, Mr. Chairman, the discussion of the vote would be on Item 76, Item (b)-(1).

President Ramer: With the question divided, we are now facing the motion to approve No. 76 (b)-(1). Is there a second?

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Davis: This was the vote of the Conference by a rather narrow majority that we throw out the bath water, and there was some concern the baby has gone with it. There was a great deal of difficulty we recognize with the 1.600 ruling, but in removing all academic standards there was some concern. The Pacific-8 Conference, recognizing this, is proposing that there be re-instituted an academic requirement which seems to us to be very consistent with the entrance requirement of most universities. The entering student must have a high-school grade point average of 2.000. We feel this is consistent with most universities, recognizes the academic standards of institutions and provides for their prerogatives beyond that.

Edward M. Bennett (Washington State University): This proposal, I would like to suggest, be voted 1, 2, 3, for this reason: I don't believe there is any institution represented in this room that does not have a progress rule that is similar to 1.7, 1.8, 1.9 or 2.0 over a four-year period. I think this gives us the opportunity to make sure that we do maintain these standards that everybody can live with.

I didn't think the business brought up before, about arguing relative to it being impossible because of a new grading standard to do this, has relevancy, because they do it in other things.

So I would urge the adoption of all three items.

Ernest Casale (Temple University): Mr. Chairman, if you have to have 2.000 average, you couldn't know this until June, so how are you going to offer scholarships before that. Somebody said withdraw. The question is: Can you offer the scholarship and then withdraw it?

Mr. Davis: The legislation does not change the intent of the grant-in-aid material. If you read the deleted material or the material it is proposed to be deleted, when you award the grant or whatever it does not change.

[Proposal No. 76 (b)-(1), (page A-42), was approved by a show of hands.]

Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, if the Chair would indulge an editorial correction in (2), just before the words "grade point" at the end of the fourth line, we would like to insert the words "minimum accumulative" so the line would read: "collegiate athletes to student-athletes who have a minimum accumulative grade point average."

President Ramer: The Chair rules that is acceptable. Proceed.

Mr. Davis: The question that was brought up earlier upon academic standards relates also to the continuance of students. I move the approval of Item (b)-(2).

[The motion was seconded.]

The academic standards of an institution also provide for progression of students through the university. We felt, since the 1.600 was removed there should be consideration by the Convention of contin-

uing academic standards within the institution beyond the 1.600. Here again we felt the progression of 1.7, 1.8 and 2.0 would provide a floor for most institutions; and we felt then academic progress of students could be checked appropriately and in consistency with most institutions' requirements.

Jesse Hill (Pacific Coast Athletic Association): I would like to invite your attention to Proposal 77 (b)-(2), which provides that continuing eligibility under that proposal would still remain autonomous with the institution or with the conference if the conference has rules respecting this. I believe the time has come when we should do everything we can to protect and preserve the autonomy of the institution or the autonomy of the conference relative to continuing grade point requirements.

Alan Chapman (Rice University): I am speaking for myself, not the Council or the Committee.

I personally feel that this maintenance requirement will prove very distasteful to a large segment of the Association because it makes no distinction between the academic demands between institutions or within major programs in the single institution. What it will do will be actively regressive and force athletes into the less demanding courses they can find in order to keep their average up.

Curtis A. Coutts (State University of New York, Binghamton): This would also impose a hardship on our institution in which we have just about abolished grades in terms of grade point average. We no longer figure grade point averages. We use pass-fail grades, and a student must have rate of progress to be in school.

I don't know how we would interpret this kind of standard of grade point average to be eligible under our system.

E. John Larsen (University of Southern California): In addition to the last two comments, I would like to express my opposition to Section (b)-(2) because a 2.000 grade point average calculation in Institution X, which offers grade points 4.0 for A, 3.0 for B, 2.0 for C, and 1.0 for D and 0 for F, is vastly different from the institutions with different point systems and the increasing number of institutions, including ours, who gave no grades below a C.

I urge the Convention to oppose (b)-(2).

[Proposal No. 76 (b)-(2), (page A-42), was defeated by a show of hands.]

Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I ask for another ruling from the Chair please on (3). There are two changes in that item proposed, in bold type. If the item is adopted, it would adopt, of course, both items; but since there was a division of the question and the first question already accepted, I presume the bold-faced type reading "graduate from high school with the minimum 2.000 grade point average must" is already accepted as a part of the motion. What we would be voting on is the change from 1.600 to 1.800. Would that be a correct assumption, sir?

President Ramer: I would rule that is true.

Mr. Davis: Again, for the same reasons, gentlemen, then I would move the adoption of (3).

[The motion was seconded.]

Again, for the same reasons of maintaining academic standards in our institution, in this particular case for the junior college transfer,

it seemed very appropriate that instead of requiring the 1.600 which was consistent with the old rule, that we have an opportunity here to look at a change in standards. We should simply suggest that the junior college transfer who has been in the junior college for two years and wishes to transfer with a minimum of 48 semester hours should have a 1.800 grade point average before transferring.

Jesse Hill (Pacific Coast Athletic Association): Mr. President, I would like to invite your attention to Proposal No. 77 (b)-(3). Now for a long time many of us, many of you, have felt that a student-athlete, who graduates from high school with a 1.900 grade point average, is required to go to junior college for four semesters or six quarters. We feel there is something to be said for redemption. We feel there is something to be said for that student-athlete on the basis of one-tenth of a grade point average to redeem himself.

If you will note, we have four divisions whereby such a student-athlete who graduates with less than a 2.000 grade point average can qualify for athletic financial aid for eligibility for practice and eligibility for competition. We have it with four semesters or six quarters, 48 degree credit units, with a 2.000 average. We have the possibility for the boy to go three semesters or four quarters with 36 semester units or 48 quarter units with a 2.250 grade point average. It is also possible for the boy to redeem himself in one year by completing 24 units or 36 units with a 2.500 grade point average and be in residence two semesters or three quarters.

Gentlemen, we want you to consider the student-athlete and what is right and fair. I realize that many boys have had to go to junior college for four semesters or six quarters due to the fact that under the 1.600 legislation they had a predictability of 1.590. So I would hope you would give this consideration in voting on Item 3.

Joseph Pease (Fort Lewis College): I would like a little clarification if I may, please. Do I assume correctly that you ruled that when we passed (b)-(1), we now included (b)-(1) less the italics plus the black print back into our Bylaws, or just the black print?

President Ramer: Less the italics, sir.

Mr. Pease: You mean by this action we put (b)-(1) back in there when we just removed it?

President Ramer: I am still basing my decision here on the determination made this morning. It would be appropriate to face No. 76 and No. 77 and possibly the succeeding ones after action on 75. Gentlemen, I think it is the will of the Convention that we do so.

John A. Fuzak (Michigan State University): I am speaking in opposition to what Jesse Hill just stated, and I urge you to vote for (3) in 76, rather than the one he proposed. Certainly the academic standard is a very low one. Frankly, I am a little dismayed with what happened in terms of what I have always considered a floor, a very low floor. I hate to face my colleagues again, but I won't go through that except to say that it seems to me that the individual who cannot earn a 2.000 in high school ought to spend those years in the junior college. I think generally speaking the junior college is better able to provide and cope with his problems than our four-year universities.

So I would urge you to vote for (3) in this section, rather than defer toward the one coming up in the next group.

Edward S. Betz (University of the Pacific): You will note under (3) that is now being considered, the student who does not make a 2,000 average in high school then spends four semesters in junior college and cannot make a 2,000 in the junior college, would become eligible at any university that would admit him. So I think the gentleman from Michigan is confused. If a student cannot make a 2,000 in high school and cannot make a 2,000 in four semesters in junior college, I urge you to give consideration to (3) of No. 77.

Mr. Davis: All of this is rather confusing to me. I would like to make a comment that would help my confusion. It seems to me, unless we adopt one of these (3's), in No. 76 or No. 77, we are left without any rules for transfer from junior college. I don't think this Convention wants to leave that problem wide open without having any academic standards for transfer of students from junior colleges. It seems to me this Convention is faced with adopting either (3) in No. 76, which is 1,800, or (3) in No. 77, which is 2,000 plus some other things. The decision might be just that simple.

[Proposal No. 76 (b)-(3), (page A-43), was defeated 145-169.]

1,600 Rule

President Ramer: Now we are facing No. 77. I believe No. 77 is to be presented by Mr. Hill of the Pacific Coast Conference.

Jesse Hill (Pacific Coast Athletic Association): Mr. President, I have a problem here. I would like to withdraw (b)-(1).

President Ramer: Mr. Hill, representing the Pacific Coast Conference, would like to withdraw the first paragraph under (b).

Mr. Hill: Mr. President, I think I am out of order. I would like, first, to move that we divide Proposal No. 77.

President Ramer: Jesse, let's move the approval of the motion, first, and we will get a second to that. Is there a second?

[The motion was seconded.]

You want to move now the proposal to divide the question?

Mr. Hill: Yes.

President Ramer: All right. Is there a second to this?

[The motion was seconded.]

[Motion to divide question was approved by a show of hands.]

Mr. Hill: Now, Mr. President, I would like to withdraw (b)-(1).

[Proposal No. 77 (b)-(1), (page A-43), was withdrawn.]

Mr. President, I move the approval of Proposition No. 77 (b)-(2).

[The motion was seconded.]

Michael M. Fleischer (Herbert H. Lehman College): I would like a clarification. Proposal No. 77 reads: "A member institution shall not be eligible to enter a team or individual competitors in an NCAA-sponsored meet . . ." This is different from No. 76. Is that right?

President Ramer: It is the same, sir.

[Proposal No. 77 (b)-(2), (page A-44), was approved by a show of hands.]

Mr. Hill: Mr. President, I would like to move the approval of Proposal No. 77 (b)-(3).

[The motion was seconded.]

William Davis, (Texas Technological University): Mr. President, I tried to ask Jesse this question privately, and he didn't have a chance to answer it.

Am I correct that (3) primarily changes the junior college rule?

Is that the thrust of that amendment? That is all I can see.

Alan Chapman (Rice University): Mr. President, I think we have no junior college rules.

Mr. Davis: Mr. President, we have junior college rules.

Mr. Chapman: We voted it out, Bill.

Mr. Davis: I really have a question, Mr. President, because I am thoroughly confused. It occurs to me that (3) here is a new junior college rule. I thought we had a junior college rule, and some of my colleagues shout me down and say we don't. I thought it was under the transfer provisions that we have a junior college rule.

Wayne Duke (Big Ten Conference): Mr. President, it would appear to me this particular provision waters down the junior college transfer rule and provides a more lenient academic base for junior college transfers to four-year collegiate institutions. For that reason I think the Big Ten Conference would oppose this particular proposal.

Mr. Davis: That is what I was afraid he was doing. I didn't know for sure he was.

President Ramer: You have Wayne Duke's word for it.

Mr. Davis: I don't have Jesse Hill's word for it. Jesse is still fumbling through his pages.

President Ramer: Let's see what Jack Fuzak's word is.

Jack Fuzak (Michigan State University): I guess that is what I was trying to point out at an earlier time and didn't do it very successfully. Obviously the thrust of this is to make what is now the sub-predictor transferrable at an earlier time so he could work out in spring football, etc., after being there only three semesters. So the thrust of this was fairly obvious, and I thought that that was the direction in which it moved.

However, I would like to point out also that we now have a dilemma because we have abandoned the 1,600 by voting down (3), and we will have nothing else before us unless we vote in favor of this.

Mr. Davis: That was the rest of my question, Mr. President. [Laughter] I really want us to be clear on this, Mr. President.

Ernest Casale (Temple University): We have more problems than that because we do have a transfer rule here under individual eligibility under 4 (1)-(d), and that is there with the 1,600 rule. Before we leave we had better do something about that.

Mr. Davis: Mr. President, my concern is to try to find out where we are on these things, and I am not sure that we have had a complete answer. We have had some part answers to it, but basically and before us right now is the question of No. 77, Section (3). I am not quite sure that that is a satisfactory answer.

Edward M. Bennett (Washington State University): I would like to ask the Chair to ask for a ruling from the parliamentarian, looking at the old rule, and see if indeed it did wipe it out. That might help to straighten things out.

President Ramer: I think the question is persisting, and they are returning now apparently to the parliamentarian, asking whether we did indeed by previous action wipe out the old transfer rule. Am I correct in the question?

Mr. Bennett: That is correct.

Marcus Plant (University of Michigan): I would think we did not, although we did wipe out those provisions of the transfer rule that

refer or are based upon 1.600; but the transfer rule to which reference was just made in Article 4, Section 1, for individual eligibility, is still on the books. There will have to be editorial changes made in it to get the 1.600 reference out. I don't think it wipes out the rule.

The provision before us now will go in as a matter of institutional eligibility to participate in NCAA meets and tournaments but not individual eligibility.

Mr. Bennett: So we would be left then without one phase of it.

President Ramer: But it would not affect seasonal eligibility, as I understand it from the interpretation, nor those involving transfer not directly associated with 1.600.

Edward S. Betz (University of the Pacific): I think all we need to do is to recall what the gentleman from Oregon said. We need one or the other of these (3) items. Otherwise we are left without any method of determining the eligibility of a junior college transfer who did not have a 2.000 when he entered the junior college.

If the student does not have the 2.000 when he graduates from high school, according to the legislation we have just adopted, there is no way to make him eligible in the university unless we adopt either (3) of No. 76 or (3) of No. 77. When we voted down (3) of No. 76, therefore, it is obvious we must adopt No. 77 or have no eligibility requirements for such a student.

[Proposal No. 77 (b)-(3), (page A-44), was approved by a show of hands.]

1.600 Rule

President Ramer: We now move to No. 78. The Chair recognizes Harry Cross of the University of Washington.

Harry Cross (University of Washington): Mr. President, contrary to the usual statement, I do have certain pride of authorship in this, particularly the ingenuity which I have demonstrated by getting this relatively simple proposal; but since it ties in with the 1.600, I ask permission to withdraw it.

[Proposal No. 78 (page A-45) was withdrawn.]

1.600 Rule

Jack Fuzak (Michigan State University): Mr. Chairman, I had the responsibility for presenting this on behalf of the Council, and since the same things apply, I ask permission to withdraw it.

[Proposal No. 79 (page A-46) was withdrawn.]

1.600 Rule

Richard Havel (Hunter College): Mr. Chairman, we move the adoption of No. 80.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Chairman, we submitted four amendments to this convention, in the expectation that one of the four might serve the largest majority of the membership assembled. We have done this on the advice of legal counsel, and our concern is for youngsters who participate in our programs by virtue of having no entrance examination other than a requirement of being in the upper 50 per cent of the graduating class or having an average of 80 or over in terms of admission to the four-year institutions that constitute the University of New York.

We submitted four amendments, and my comments are addressed to all of these, simply because they are in order—Nos. 80, 81, 82 and 83.

What we are requesting from this group is a judgment in terms of fairness and the hope that our comments will address themselves solely to merits of participation with respect to youngsters who come into our system on the open admission policy.

The open admission policy is not as simply interpreted as might have been described in the various newspapers or in the articles that are written in professional journals. All we are suggesting is that we expect that this group in its judgment, in terms of fairness and fair play, will give some consideration to the four amendments that we propose.

I make this comment simply because there are four that we submitted, and I trust that the membership will vote in terms of their conscience and give these a fair hearing.

Michael M. Fleischer (Herbert H. Lehman College): I am just a little confused on this thing now. After we first abolished 1.600, we now have 2.000. We voted a 2.000 in. Would it be in order to apply the four amendments Hunter College is proposing to the 2.000? They would refer to the present legislation, in effect, since we seem to be changing every fifteen minutes or so.

President Ramer: Our parliamentarian studied this over the luncheon interim and rules that No. 80 may be applicable but not Nos. 81, 82 and 83. In other words, No. 80, as it stands now, in the ruling of the Chair, is in order.

Mr. Fleischer: Thank you. Then I would ask that the Convention adopt No. 80, which would allow those institutions which do not recruit at least to be exempted from the 2.000. We are in the position where we are told by our college president, any student who is admitted to the school, duly matriculated, must be eligible for our program. This means we are in direct violation of what was the 1.600 rule and now is the 2.000 rule. So I ask that the exemption be made.

[Proposal No. 80 (page A-47) was defeated by a show of hands.]

John W. Hermann (California State University, Los Angeles): Point of information. This document we just passed, in reference to 2.000 and junior college transfers, is that in reference to in-season play or strictly NCAA play?

President Ramer: NCAA events, not in-season play.

Mr. Hermann: So in-season play is institutional control or conference control. Is that correct?

President Ramer: That is correct.

Charles Nelms (Big Eight Conference): Point of order. Mr. Chairman, would you mind repeating? Maybe I misunderstood the question, but I would appreciate it if the question would be repeated as well as the response.

Mr. Hermann: I asked if the legislation just passed in reference to the 2.000 out of high school and the junior college or the progression, is that requirement strictly for NCAA playoffs or during the whole season, like the 1.600 was before?

President Ramer: The Chair said that this legislation would be applicable to eligibility for NCAA events and not to in-season competition.

Mr. Hermann: Therefore, in-season play is under institutional control or conference control.

President Ramer: The Chair is in error. I am going to ask our parliamentarian to comment on this.

Marcus Plant (University of Michigan—Parliamentarian): I would reach a different conclusion on the language that a member institution shall not be eligible, and I might say this goes to institutional eligibility to enter teams or individual competitors. A member institution shall not be eligible to enter a team or individual competitors in an NCAA sponsored meet or tournament unless the institution in its conduct of all its intercollegiate programs follows (1), (2) and (3).

President Ramer: So in effect the legislation is appropriate to the establishment of eligibility for in-season as well as NCAA events, institutional eligibility.

Mr. Neinas: In other words, if I can clarify this in my own mind, Bylaw 4 (1)-(d), the junior college transfer rule, applying to individuals for in-season championship events, has not been touched by this legislation. We have gone to Bylaw 4 (6)-(b) and in effect have established No. 76 (b)-(1) for the incoming students, No. 77 (b)-(2) for continuing eligibility—this is during the regular season now—and No. 77 (b)-(3) for those students who transfer from a junior college to a four-year institution for in-season eligibility.

Is that a correct analysis?

President Ramer: Our parliamentarian rules—yes.

Mr. Neinas: My second question is, inasmuch as Rule 75 was effective immediately, which was the repeal of 1,600, do we have a motion to have effective immediately what the Convention has just adopted?

President Ramer: Such a motion would be in order.

Mr. Neinas: Then I move that the three items I have just mentioned be effective immediately; if I understand it, between now and next August we have it.

Delegate: Point of order, Mr. Chairman. I would like to call your attention to the fact that the legislation we have just passed, in particular No. 77 (3), refers only to those junior college transfers who do not obtain a 2,000 and makes no reference to junior college transfers whose high school record was 2,000 or better.

[Motion to make Proposals No. 76 and No. 77 effective immediately was approved by a show of hands.]

Marcus Plant (Parliamentarian): It might be helpful to the convention to point out there are companion proposals associated with Nos. 77 and 76 which are intended to affect transfer rules. Those are Nos. 86 and 87, one proposed by the Pacific Coast Athletic Association and one proposed by the Pacific-8 Conference. It is at that point that the transfer rule, if adopted, will be effective; but legislation we have passed so far only relates to the policy of the institution with respect to its eligibility to participate in NCAA meets and tournaments.

Robert Flynn (Boston College): Mr. President, point of information. Since No. 75 is effective immediately, I would like to know the status of sub-predictors that are in college at the present time.

President Ramer: You know, gentlemen, if we attempt to make interpretations on all of this legislation in the time extending between now and adjournment, I am afraid we are going to have difficulty. What would you say to this, Marc? What about those students who have been sub-predictors already determined in our program?

Mr. Plant: It seems to me this is a policy matter that ought to be considered by the Council and handled by official interpretation rather than by parliamentary ruling.

President Ramer: The Council meets tomorrow; and I would like, as presiding officer, to request Council's attention to this and the development of an interpretation that will move out quickly to all institutions. I would like to request, further, that all other aspects of transfer rules that have given great difficulty to the discussion be given attention in the Council meeting tomorrow and on all these difficult questions that we have interpretations moving as swiftly as feasible from the Council to the membership.

J. D. Morgan (University of California, Los Angeles): I would like to remind the membership of the policy that I believe has always been prevalent in the Council in such cases. When we have enacted legislation that is less restrictive we have always given the athlete the benefit of the doubt and relieved him of the restriction.

1,600 Rule

President Ramer: Gentlemen, we move on the agenda. I will rule out of order Items Nos. 81, 82 and 83, and call for attention then on the Convention floor to Proposal No. 84.

[Proposal No. 84 (page A-49) was withdrawn.]

1,600 Rule

Jesse Hill (Pacific Coast Athletic Association): Mr. President I would like to move the approval of No. 85.

[Proposal No. 85 (page A-50) was seconded and approved by a show of hands.]

Transfer Rule

Mr. Hill: Mr. President, I would like to move the approval of Proposal No. 86, as stipulated. This clears up the transfers.

[The motion was seconded.]

[Proposal No. 86 (page A-50) was approved by a show of hands.]

[Proposal No. 87 (page A-51) was withdrawn.]

Ernest Casale (Temple University): Mr. President, before we get into another legislative matter and get away from the 1,600, to settle the problems in Article 4-(1), couldn't we move that Article 4-(1) be rewritten to conform with the amendments we have approved today, make that official?

I would so move.

[The motion was seconded.]

[Motion to rewrite Section 1 to conform to amendments to Section 1 was approved by a show of hands.]

[Proposal No. 88 (page A-51) and Proposal No. 92 (page A-53) were withdrawn.]

Transfer Rule

David Ocorr (University of Scranton): Mr. President, I would move the adoption of Proposal No. 89.

[The motion was seconded.]

I would like to eliminate a double and sometimes triple penalty that has existed for many years. It is my belief we should work with these students and not turn them away from our program.

[Proposal No. 89 (page A-52) was approved 153-123.]

Transfer Rule

Jesse Hill (Pacific Coast Athletic Association): Mr. President, I move the approval of No. 90, which covers the situation with the student-athlete from junior college who did not have a 2.000 grade point average out of high school.

[Proposal No. 90 (page A-52) was approved by a show of hands.]

[Proposal No. 91 (page A-53) was withdrawn.]

Recruiting Publicity

Adolph Samborski (Yankee Conference): Mr. Chairman, I move the approval of No. 51 by deleting the words in italics and adding the words in bold face.

President Ramer: The motion has been made and seconded.

Mr. Samborski: The intent is to permit normal publicity but continue the prohibition against elaborate affairs to announce a prospective student-athlete's commitment and further, to prohibit publicizing of a prospective student-athlete's visit to the campus.

[Proposal No. 51 (page A-33) was approved by a show of hands.]

Sports Camps

Robert C. James (Atlantic Coast Conference): Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of Item No. 52, which would amend Article 1 of the Bylaws by adding a new Section 8.

[The motion was seconded.]

Jack Davis (Oregon State University): Mr. Chairman, I am in sympathy with the intent here, but I think that is in the nature of an over-kill. There are a large number of letter-winners in high school or junior college, people who would have no opportunities to play ball in college because of their ability or lack of ability. This tends to restrict these kids from participation in the sports camp. I think it is over-kill in the sense that any award-winner would not be able to participate.

Mr. James: It does not preclude participation. It precludes their employment for free or reduced tuition rates.

John W. Harbaugh (Stanford University): It seems to me we go beyond the bounds of the NCAA purview here. You can imagine the situation when the son of a coach is employed in a coaching camp; and if he had won an award in high school, he would be forbidden by this legislation. That is really well beyond the proper scope of the NCAA.

I ask that this legislation be opposed.

Delegate: Does the Council or the NCAA Enforcement Committee have any idea of violations of this nature. Are they very substantial in number, or is this an assumption something like this is going to take place.

Mr. James: Yes, we have had indications from many coaches who felt they were going to be forced into the summer camp business. They did not wish to start it because it was becoming such a recruiting device. Too frequently, they informed us that the coach, whether it be an assistant or head coach, on first visitation to the young man in recruitment process invited him to work at their camp. I call to your attention that they may pay him the going rate for that position in the camp which in some instances is considerable.

Delegate: That is documented information?

Mr. James: Yes, sir. As an experience factor, our basketball coaches in my conference, each of whom has a summer camp, voluntarily accomplished this last year; and they felt it solved so many problems that they endorse it 100 per cent.

[Proposal No. 52 (page A-33) was approved by a show of hands.]

Sports Camps

Mr. James: Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of Item No. 53, which would amend Official Interpretation 112.

[The motion was seconded.]

Curtis A. Coutts (State University of New York, Binghamton): I would only add to move that this become effective immediately, rather than the August 1, 1973 date, so that we can continue the same Bylaw that is in earlier existence and not run into discrepancies of sports camps which are going to be run before August 1.

[Motion to make No. 53 effective immediately approved by a show of hands.]

[Proposal No. 53 (page A-33) approved by a show of hands.]

Mr. James: If it is in order, sir, to simplify, and for the same gentleman who requested the date immediately for No. 53, I would like to ask that No. 52 become effective immediately, so we would not have the same problem in the summer.

[Motion to make No. 52 effective immediately approved by a show of hands.]

Off-Campus Entertainment

William Davis (Texas Technological University): Mr. President, I move the adoption of the amendment of the Bylaws, Article 1, Section (5)-(e).

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. President and gentlemen. The whole object of this is clarification. We have been a little vague in this point as to what is reasonable entertainment, and we are trying to just specify a monetary amount. I don't think this means you are going to have to automatically spend this much money, but it does set a kind of guideline and limit to what you can spend for entertainment of visiting prospects in athletics.

[Proposal No. 54 (page A-34) was approved by a show of hands.]

Complimentary Tickets

George Ilg (Fresno State College): Mr. Chairman, I move we amend O.I. 122 as outlined in Proposal No. 55.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent is to restrict the use of complimentary tickets to those who accompany the prospective athletic student on his visit to the campus.

[Proposal No. 55 (page A-34) was approved by a show of hands.]

Recruiting Contracts

Robert W. Pritchard (Worcester Polytechnic Institute): Mr. President, I move Proposal No. 56 to amend O.I. 105.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent is to clarify that a prospective student-athlete may not be contacted at the site of his high school, college preparatory school or junior college competition except under certain prescribed conditions.

[Proposal No. 56 (page A-35) was approved by a show of hands.]

Automobile Transportation

Stan Bates (Western Athletic Conference): Mr. Chairman, I refer to Proposal No. 57. I move to amend Article 1, Section 5-(d)-(1) by the addition of the sentence set forth in bold type.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. President, this is to clarify the type of car that may be used for the transportation of parents or friends or relatives accompanying the prospective student to the campus.

[Proposal No. 57 (page A-35) was approved by a show of hands.]

Entertainment

Robert W. Pritchard (Worcester Polytechnic Institute): Mr. Chairman, I move Proposal No. 58 to amend Article 1, Section 5-(d)-(3).

[The motion was seconded.]

This is merely to conform to the provisions of this section.

[Proposal No. 58 (page A-36) was approved by a show of hands.]

Entertainment

Keith L. Broman (University of Nebraska): We have a slight change in that Amendment No. 120, changes the language of No. 59 to meet some objections in our original proposal. The language is changed, as you see. I move the approval of Amendment No. 120.

President Ramer: No. 59.

Mr. Broman: I move the approval of Proposal 59.

[The motion was seconded.]

I move to amend this by Proposal 120 which states a number. You notice it says "a maximum of two." Before we simply said "complimentary tickets."

If I might respond, this is really to make permanent the material that appeared in last summer's NCAA News, in which a one-year extension of a problem that was presented was handled in this way. We feel this is normal hospitality and well within the meaning of the NCAA Code.

Richard Post (California State University, San José): Mr. Chairman, this part where it refers to high school coaches, does that also refer to college preparatory schools and junior colleges as well?

President Ramer: I would certainly accept that as an editorial comment and friendly amendment.

[Proposal No. 59 (page A-36) was approved as amended by Proposal No. 120 (page A-67) by a show of hands.]

President Ramer: We will move to Item No. 60. Gentlemen, our parliamentary rules that this motion is out of order because of its conflict with the decision already reached by the Convention. There being no objection, we will move on to No. 61. Wade Stinson, University of Kansas.

Football Bowl Officials

Wade Stinson (University of Kansas): Mr. President, the Extra Events Committee, through permission of the Council, wishes to withdraw this proposal.

President Ramer: There being no objection, the Chair rules approval. We move now to Proposal No. 62. Bill Wall of MacMurray College.

Basketball Playing Season

William L. Wall (MacMurray College): Mr. President, I move amendment, Proposal No. 62.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent is to provide 28 contests—two scrimmages and 26 games—to take full advantage of all revenue opportunities available in basketball.

Alan Chapman (Rice University): Mr. Chairman, the Council has asked me to speak in opposition to this proposal. We feel the basketball season is long enough as it is; and with the current practice of going to the early calendar, increasing the practice of playing basketball games during the examination period around December, this will only aggravate the problem. We suggest you vote against it.

[Proposal No. 62 (page A-37) was defeated by a show of hands.]

Baseball Playing Season

Harry Cross (University of Washington): Mr. President, I move the adoption of Item No. 63 with reference to limitation on baseball games.

[The motion was seconded.]

John W. Winkin (Colby College): Mr. President, I am president of the National Association of College Baseball Coaches; and at our recent baseball convention, which over 800 coaches attended, they wished to express unanimous opposition to this amendment.

I would also personally like to speak to the main problem that I see with the amendment. It says that you count games or scrimmages. What this means is that you count in the total of your fall baseball program any scrimmages in the total season. For those of you who are in the north and wish to send your team on a southern trip, you will find your team will eventually lose out on a southern trip. The southern institutions in determining their total count of fifty, in which they will have to include their fall baseball as well as their scrimmages, will begin to decide on their number of teams and probably cut out a number of the northern institutions that count on the southern trip.

Stanley H. Watts (Brigham Young University): I would like to move to amend the amendment to include the proposal in Item No. 64, that we raise the number of games from 50 to 60, to provide the northern schools in the colder climates a chance to participate and get activity in preconference training. I think it will still be minimal, and we can help those schools to get along much more than we can with the minimum of 50 games.

President Ramer: Thank you, sir. The Chair honors the proposal to amend No. 63 through consideration of No. 64. Is there a second?

[The motion was seconded.]

We are now discussing, gentlemen, the motion to amend No. 63 through the use of Proposal No. 64. Is there discussion?

Mr. Cross: Mr. Chairman, this matter, as you know, has been before the Convention in one sense or another and before the Council for a considerable period of time. After taking into account all the many suggestions, and some even more ingenious than the two we have just heard, the Council finally concluded, in the light of the circumstances, that there is a sizable amount of discontent and the feeling that baseball does interfere with the academic program during

the year. We felt this amendment was very generous.

Therefore, I urge you to approve the principal amendment.

[Proposal No. 64 (page A-38) was defeated by a show of hands.]

David R. Ocorr (University of Scranton): I believe this is curtailing legislation for programs which have a compatible baseball program with academic and with the policy of the institution. When you have such a program, why should we legislate against them? I don't believe this is good legislation, Mr. President.

Tom Warner (Butler University): Speaking as an athletic director and a baseball coach, I see this matter a lot differently than I am sure some of you do. Many times baseball games are double-headers, and we play two games in one day. We play seven innings rather than nine innings. If the kids are not out playing a ball game, they are out practicing anyway. The extra added expense for those schools who can afford it I think is well worth the effort.

In Southern climes, where they can play extensive baseball programs in both fall and spring, I think this would be a shame to pass this legislation. Those of us in the North cannot play quite as many ball games and are a little envious of the institutions in the South, but we don't want to hold baseball back. We would like to see baseball progress.

I urge the rejection of this proposal.

Larry Koentopp (Gonzaga University): I feel, coming from the North where we can play 40 games, we would be penalizing the South because they do have good weather. It should be an institutional matter. We would be opening a can of worms, for they could have 50 or 60 varsity games and another 50 J.V. games; and we would be going down and playing a J.V. schedule.

Fred Miller (Arizona State University): The survey we ran showed the schools had an average of 85 games. I think you will find there will be an extreme disadvantage in scheduling because we will be looking for the best competition we can find. I urge the defeat of this amendment.

Michael Fleischer (Herbert H. Lehman College): Just for clarification, does this involve scheduling contests or actual playing contests? In baseball this might make a difference if it rains.

President Ramer: Harry, do you understand the question? Does this involve playing contests or scheduled contests? His response is that it involves playing contests.

[Proposal No. 63 (page A-37) was defeated 84-167.]

[Proposal No. 65 (page A-38) was withdrawn.]

Foreign Tours

Eugene Corrigan (University of Virginia): Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of Item 66.

[The motion was seconded.]

This is simply to facilitate foreign basketball tours during college vacation periods.

Edward S. Steitz (Springfield College): Mr. Chairman, as far as Springfield College is concerned, we support this legislation unequivocally. I would like to speak on behalf of the Basketball Federation and the International Relations Committee who support this amendment.

[Proposal No. 66 (page A-38) was approved by a show of hands.]

Football Championships

Edward Sherman (Muskingum College): Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the College Football Committee, I would like to move the adoption of Proposal No. 67, to amend Article 2, Section 2 and Article 3, Section 3.

I think there needs to be an editorial change also, where it says Division II it should be College Division.

The purpose of this is to permit colleges, the members of the College Division, to participate in postseason football games that are sponsored by the NCAA.

President Ramer: Thank you, Ed. The motion is to approve. Has there been a second?

[The motion was seconded.]

The Chair rules the deletion of "Division II" and the substitution of "College Division" to be editorial in character.

[Proposal No. 67 (page A-39) was approved by a show of hands.]

Football Championships

Edward Sherman (Muskingum College): Again, on behalf of the College Football Committee, I would like to move to accept Proposal No. 68 to amend Article 4, Section 6 and Article 5, Section 3, to permit College Division football championships.

President Ramer: Thank you, sir. We are assuming, further, the editorial revision comparable to that existing in No. 67. Was there a second?

[The motion was seconded.]

[Proposal No. 68 (page A-39) was approved by a show of hands.]

Freshman Rule

M. Edward Wagner (California Collegiate Athletic Association): Mr. Chairman, I move the amendment of Article 4, Section 1-(f) as indicated in Proposal No. 69.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 69 refers to the eligibility of student-athletes. Last year this body gave approval for the eligibility of freshmen providing competition in all sports, such participation to be counted as one of the four permissible seasons of varsity competition. This, of course, must be within the five calendar years' span from the time the student-athlete first registers as a full-time student at any collegiate institution.

The CCAA can find no fault, no fault whatever, with this but joins with the other institutions who have had experience of favorable and successful results. Colleges all over the United States have seen freshman student-athletes step right into the varsity role and become leading performers. This, of course, becomes a great opportunity for the freshman athlete; and it has worked pretty well for the institution as well.

What Proposition 69 says is: allow four seasons of varsity competition without reference to the so-called freshman rule.

What really constitutes a freshman has been confusing. Proposition No. 69 allows the one who needs a year of academic or social adjustment to college environment an opportunity to do so and then enables him to have four years of varsity competition. It also allows the one who, because of injury or illness or other incapacities, not to perform

in his first year or who is a late-bloomer, is given a chance to develop and mature. This allows the one who wants to climax the end of an athletic career, a four-year career, with a fifth year of college.

All this is possible through the deletion of "three seasons" and the inserting of "four seasons" in Bylaw Article 4, Section 1-(f). We think this most fair, most just. It eliminates the freshman discrimination and gives all an equal opportunity for four years of competition. The sophomore, the junior, the senior does not lose a year merely because of any of the reasons that I have mentioned happening to befall him.

We think it most advisable to ignore any reference to the academic year when there is a possibility that there is anything wrong.

Not discriminating in that fashion gives him the same opportunity of that junior or sophomore or senior. Now by allowing the four years of varsity competition in five years at no loss of one year to freshmen, it has the unanimous approval of the College Division Committee and is already in use by some. We feel it should be universally adopted. We urge the passage of Proposal No. 69.

William Davis (Texas Technological University): Mr. President, it is difficult for me to take a position in opposition to the most eloquent presentation you have just heard, but I must oppose it.

I think we took a giant step when we made freshmen eligible. I do not think it would be proper at all to change this rule at this point, to allow the freshman year to be disregarded as a year. I think the freshman competition, if he is going to compete, must be done in his freshman year and not just four years of competition to make the five year period.

As a matter of principle, I simply oppose this; and I thought I just couldn't let it go without a very meager voice of opposition.

[Proposal No. 69 (page A-40) was defeated by a show of hands.]

Hardship

Fred Jacoby (Mid-American Athletic Conference): I would like to move the adoption of Item No. 70.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this motion is twofold. The current NCAA O.I. 200 permits and defines hardship for football. The proposed amendment allows the same privilege for all other sports.

Secondly, any conference having a hardship rule would lose NCAA automatic qualification in basketball, wrestling and baseball because the conference rule would be less stringent or strict than the NCAA rule. Also individuals could not compete in other sports.

This amendment will place all sports on the same basis.

I might also point out that the Collegiate Commissioners Association, during last summer's meeting, also approved unanimously a change in this hardship rule.

For these reasons I urge your approval and adoption of Item No. 70.

Keith Broman (University of Nebraska): I would like to propose an amendment to Proposal No. 70. You will find it in No. 71. The thrust of the amendment is to substitute O.I. 408 as it appears in Proposal 71.

[The motion was seconded.]

William Davis (Texas Technological University): I have been assigned the duty of opposing both No. 70 and No. 71, and I will do it

together at this point. I am kind of in a position of opposing God, home, mother and apple pie here; and it makes it a little bit embarrassing, in a way. But I think my main principle of opposition has to come down to this. I understand that conferences can have hardship rules, institutions can determine hardship cases and those are legitimate.

What we are looking at now here is the NCAA Constitution; and I don't see how there can be a national judgment of hardship cases, coming from all over the country, without a rational basis of comparison and consideration and that sort of thing.

Unfortunately, I am in the position to be on the Eligibility Committee, where a part of this would have to come to us; and I just don't think we can do it. I think it is very fair to the young man to say, "Yes, you can have a hardship year in your conference, you can have a hardship year for in-season competition;" but I don't think we should extend it to the events beyond that, where you are competing for championship play.

Charles Nelms (Big Eight Conference): I would like to submit to the Convention that many of you may not recognize the importance of having a hardship rule which could apply for NCAA championship events. The majority of the conferences do have some type of hardship provision. When you come to NCAA championship, however, that privilege is not afforded the athlete who may be granted that additional year of eligibility by reason of hardship by his conference.

Now, in addition, automatic qualification for NCAA events requires the conferences adhere to eligibility rules as stringent as those in Bylaw 4, and there is no hardship provision in Bylaw 4. So on the basis of a survey undertaken by the Big Eight Conference, we believe O.I. 408 is compatible with the practice of the majority of the conferences throughout the country.

In addition, I point out that the hardship is not to be granted by the Association itself but by an outside agency, either the conference if it holds such affiliation or by the NCAA Eligibility Committee.

[Proposals No. 70 and No. 71 (page A-40) were approved by a show of hands.]

Allen Student-Athletes

President Ramer: We now move to No. 72, concerning Alien Student-Athletes. Is there a representative from one of the sponsoring agencies or institutions ready to present this? Is there some other person who would like to present this before the Convention. If so, please place it in motion.

Earl C. Lory (University of Montana): Mr. President, I would like to place this because it does differentiate on the foreign students. I think it is a good rule. I would like to recommend it and move its adoption.

[The motion was seconded.]

Adolph Samborski (Yankee Conference): Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the Council, I would like to speak against this proposal. This has to do, of course, with individual eligibility for NCAA events. The present Article 4, Section 1-(f)-(2) was approved by the 1971 Convention by a strong voice vote. This legislation has the support of the Council as well as the unanimous approval of the NCAA Special Hockey Committee.

The 1972 Convention defeated an amendment to modify this legislation and reaffirmed Article 4 (1)-(f)-(2) by another strong vote.

The thrust of this legislation is to discourage the recruiting of alien student-athletes generally and provide greater opportunity for the United States citizens to participate in NCAA championships. It is an attempt to equalize competitive opportunities.

I was told by Canadian administrators that our present legislation, which establishes the age of 19 in Article 4, Section 1, would be very effective in attaining our objective. You mention hockey, but this proposal would also relax the legislation under Article 4, Section 1, not only for ice hockey but also for track and field, soccer, and all the other sports.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the defeat of Proposal No. 72.

[Proposal No. 72 (page A-41) was defeated by a show of hands.]

[Brief recess]

President Ramer: Gentlemen, let's be in order. We move to Proposal No. 73. Is there a representative of the Big Sky Conference who wishes to place this before the Convention?

Transfer Rule

Harry Cockrum (Montana State University): I move the adoption of Item No. 73.

[The motion was seconded.]

We feel that the addition of this exception to the transfer rule is consistent with the present Constitution Article 3, Section 9-(b). We recommend its approval.

[Proposal No. 73 (page A-41) was approved by a show of hands.]

Eligibility for NCAA Championships

Ernest Casale (Temple University): Mr. Chairman, I move Proposal No. 74.

[The motion was seconded.]

I think the intent is obvious.

[Proposal No. 74 (page A-41) was approved by a show of hands.]

Drugs

Robert Pritchard (Worcester Polytechnic Institute): Mr. President, I move to amend Article 4 by adding a new Section 2, and I request that it become effective immediately.

[The motion was seconded.]

[Proposal No. 93 (page A-54) was approved by a show of hands.]

Ineligible Participation

George Ilg (Fresno State College): Mr. Chairman, I move to amend Article 4, Section 5, as outlined in Proposal No. 94.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent is to confirm existing policy. This proposition, if adopted, would be effective immediately.

Edward S. Betz (University of the Pacific): A question of information. It says "such season to be the season immediately following disclosure of his ineligible participation." If he were to drop out of the institution, that wouldn't count as his season of ineligibility?

President Ramer: Dr. Ilg says, "Yes."

[Proposal No. 94 (page A-54) was approved by a show of hands.]

College Division Regional Championships

Walter Hass (University of Chicago): Mr. President, I move No. 95, that we amend Article 5, Section 3-(b) and Section 4-(a) by removing the words printed in italics.

[The motion was seconded.]

It is simply to eliminate regional College Division competition effective immediately.

[Proposal No. 95 (page A-54) was approved by a show of hands.]

College Division Soccer Championship

President Ramer: Will someone interested in No. 96 please propose this for the convention floor?

Ross Smith (Massachusetts Institute of Technology): I move to amend Article 5 as specified in No. 96.

[The motion was seconded.]

[Proposal No. 96 (page A-55) was approved by a show of hands.]

College Division Lacrosse Championship

Robert T. Shields (Fairleigh Dickinson): Mr. Chairman, I would like to move the adoption of No. 97.

[The motion was seconded.]

Richard Koenig (Valparaiso University): I will save my words. You have already heard them. In effect, what it means is you will add the words in parentheses, "effective August 1, 1973," which means that the lacrosse championship will not be held until 1974. The College Committee and the Executive Committee endorse this action.

President Ramer: You are moving to amend, and it is No. 121. The motion has been seconded to amend. Is there discussion?

Mr. Shields: I would like to speak on that. The amendment comes to the Convention with the endorsement, as effective immediately, of the United States Lacrosse Coaches Association.

R. Bruce Allison (Union College, Chairman of the Lacrosse Rules and Tournament Committee): I speak on behalf of the Lacrosse Rules and Tournament Committee. From the inception of the first NCAA University Championship, it has been the intent of the Committee to have the College Division Tournament hopefully on the ground in 1974. We have been working toward that end. To try to do it prior to the time would be in the opinion of the Committee an impossibility in terms of management.

[Proposals No. 121 (page A-67) and No. 97 (page A-55) were approved by a show of hands.]

Waiver of Bylaw Provisions

Andy Geiger (Brown University): Mr. Chairman, I move to amend the Bylaws by adding a new Article 9, as stated in Proposal No. 98.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. President, one of the things about NCAA conventions is we all learn a great deal about each other and our problems. There is much legislation that we considered that is good and just for grant-in-aid programs but create serious problems for schools that award all financial aid to all students on the basis of need. Conversely, the "need" schools favor things that create problems for the grant-in-aid institutions. We need to seek ways of accommodating the needs of one type of program without damaging another.

The legislation I am proposing is intended to provide a waiver procedure for institutions who award financial aid to all of the students solely on the basis of need. It is offered not as a sweeping relief from all the Bylaws provisions of Articles 1 through 4. We are not seeking release from everything in our book, and it is not intended that way.

You will note by reading the legislation that it takes a two-thirds vote of the NCAA Council to grant a waiver, and that waiver must be upheld by the Convention membership at its subsequent convention.

This morning we heard a plea that there needs to be some compassion for the problems of grant-in-aid schools. I ask the same for the financial-need schools. We seek only legitimate relief for legitimate request. I urge your careful consideration and approval of Proposal No. 98.

John A. Fuzak (Michigan State University): I speak in behalf of the Council in opposing this amendment. We have heard comment about how sometimes it is reflected upon the integrity of the Council and upon its powers, making me think a little bit about the boy who asked his father, "Do prostitutes have babies?" and the father said, "Yes, they do, and they will all grow up to become Council members." [Laughter]

I think the Council believes that this is far too sweeping. It does not want that power. We point out that since it would have to be upheld by the Convention it is difficult for us to see where measures are so pressing that they must have immediate action by the Council which meets several times a year, it is true, without waiting for the Convention for that approval. The Council urges you to defeat this amendment.

Mr. Geiger: Mr. President, it is impossible for the member schools to know because of the program printing deadline. It is impossible for us to request waiver rights to the legislation that is going to be proposed because we don't know what legislation is going to be proposed until we receive the convention program. That is why we request the Council to consider it if there is legislation that schools, because of "unlimited admissions" offices and financial offices over which the athletic department has no control whatsoever. We would then request the Council probably to consider a waiver if one were necessary immediately following the convention, and then the membership would consider this at the next meeting.

[Proposal No. 98 (page A-56) was defeated by a show of hands.]

Enforcement Procedure

Harry Cross (University of Washington): Mr. President, it is my task to move the next three proposals—99, 100 and 101. I will do them in succession, and I ask also that each be made effective immediately.

These are the enabling legislation to modify our infractions procedure and to provide, first, in No. 99 primarily to put the initial adjudicatory function in the Infractions Committee rather than in the present fact-finding determination only, and establishes the right of an institution to have such a penalty proposal reviewed by the Council.

Mr. Chairman, I move approval of No. 99.

[The motion was seconded.]

President Ramer: The motion has been made and seconded. This is a proposal to amend the Constitution. Now discussion.

Michael Fleischer (Herbert H. Lehman College): I would like a ruling from the Chair as to the effect of No. 100, subparagraph (2) in which it says: "All members of the Association are under an obligation to cooperate with the executive director (and his staff)" etc., in view of turning down the constitutional amendment which obligated the institution to do so.

Mr. Cross: I think perhaps I can respond and take care of your problem. The other put a direct obligation in institutional violation. The member institutions have the present obligation to cooperate. It recognizes the change in mechanics of the initiation of investigation. It is nothing more than that, sir.

William Davis (Texas Technological University): Let me add one comment for clarification. I think it is good for the whole membership to be able to refer to the Appendix which really is the heart of this thing. These are simply enabling proposals to put that new enforcement procedure into effect.

The enforcement procedure is written up in detail at that point.

Rev. Edmund P. Joyce (Notre Dame University): I may have missed this before, but is Appendix D an entirely new procedure governing the enforcement program, based upon the recommendations that are now before the Council, or is it the old one?

Mr. Cross: It is in fact modified in substantial fashion, as explained at an earlier time in the NCAA News and as set forth in Appendix D.

Father Joyce: I may be amiss in not reading Appendix D, because that may cover some of the things I was going to say. I think I will go ahead and say them, and you can point out to me, Dr. Cross or others, if they have been taken care of.

Actually, the objectivity I believe in the changes in the Constitution and Bylaws are for the purpose of improving the enforcement procedures. I have had occasion to become acquainted with them in unfortunate ways. In fact, some of the more unpleasant hours of my life, I think, have been spent on these issues.

This does not mean that we have been brought before the board in any substantial cases. In fact, it is quite different from that. I think they were so insubstantial they did not warrant the time and attention and concern that we were forced to give to them. But be that as it may, I felt by getting personally involved that there were very serious weaknesses in the entire enforcement procedure of this organization.

One of the chief weaknesses I felt was that the Committee on Infractions operated pretty much as a prosecuting arm together with the people assigned from the main office of the NCAA to pursue the cases or charges that have been made against institutions.

It was my hope that in suggesting some modifications of this they would remove that dual function because here I think is where the problems arose.

I felt that the people involved on the Committee on Infractions and the executive staff were not as responsible for the bad situation as they were captives of it. It seemed to me they were acting as prosecutor and jury at the same time and have put the school in a

very, very poor position to defend itself against an objective jury. The result was you simply had to go before the Council and involve them in jury work.

Now, as I read the changes that are being suggested, the Council is attempting to remove itself from the part they had played to some extent in the past and put even more of a burden upon the Committee on Infractions to become involved together with the executive director in precipitating and taking care of the charges and doing something about actually imposing penalties. You do have the right to appeal to the Council, but again I think the main objection I have to that still exists. There is no separation from the prosecutor and the jury.

Another comment—and I am commenting on all these things in general—would be that under No. 99, it is mentioned that the Committee on Infractions present and voting at any duly called meeting, therefore, will have the power to take disciplinary or corrective actions.

One of the objections I also had was the fact that frequently on the Committee on Infractions you had only one or two men there, acting as the persons making a decision. When you are talking with them about these problems, you have not a very widespread group to appeal to. It seems to me that this deficiency is still there, unless in Appendix D this has been taken care of. Just to read this wording in the Constitution it looks like if you had one man present and voting, he would have the power to establish the disciplinary corrective actions. Maybe you call for some sort of quorum. I do note you are increasing the number from three to five. My point is: Are you going to insist upon five being there or at least a large number?

Mr. Cross: I think it is indeed unfortunate, Father Joyce, that you have not read the NCAA News and the Appendix. The objections you advance are taken into account, partly because of the letter that came from Notre Dame after your unfortunate experience. I think they have all been met. There can be no decision made by less than three members of the Infractions Committee under the proposed procedure. It will take at least three to impose penalties in any situation. The procedure also calls, in cases involving major violations, that every effort will be made by the chairman that all five members be there.

The purpose of increasing to five is in the less important situations to act by panels and also to get a wider geographical membership on the committee if possible for the three.

Father Joyce: That is fine. I am delighted to hear it.

William Davis (Texas Technological University): Mr. Chairman, may I add one other thing he commented on? That is that you still have the complete power of appeal to the Council on any kind of decision.

Father Joyce: That is a good step, except that there are disadvantages to that because I gather again from my experience that the Council looks upon the executive group—in this case Mr. Brown who has been handling this for the Association for a long time—and I think upon the Committee on Infractions as being an extension of themselves. I think it is improper.

What I think we really need in instances like this would be an

objective sort of jury perhaps drawn from the membership—I mean a qualified group who can come in and don't have any particular vested interest in this particular case—that could listen dispassionately to both sides, to the prosecutor who I say is the executive director and the Committee on Infractions, and perhaps to a lesser extent the Council, and then determine the facts, not try to establish the penalty but at least determine the facts of the case.

I am sure that some day, unless this kind of thing is rigorously controlled, the NCAA is going to wind up in court because of some dissatisfied institution.

President Ramer: This is a concern that has been faced and discussed time and time again. It is difficult to establish a balance between these two kinds of influences in the determination of some kind of end result in our procedure. I would like to ask Dr. Cross to speak to this whole matter again, if he will.

Mr. Cross: With the possible exception of the circumstance to keep the staff from going without any guidance from faculty representatives or athletic directors of our member institutions, the Infractions Committee, under the new procedure, is essentially removed from the investigative part of it; and the hearing will be more the sort that Father Joyce speaks of. The investigative staff will present to the Infractions Committee what they believe to be the factual situation. The institution charged will have its opportunity then to present its version of it, and it will be basically relatively informal procedure by which conversation and questions can come from the committee or the staff or the institution to clarify the situation. Both the staff and the institution will be discharged at that time from the hearing room, and the Infractions Committee will make the determination as to the facts, make a determination as to the proposed penalty and having made that determination notify the institution of the proposed penalty. If it is in agreement with the proposed penalty, it will be announced; and that will be the end of it. If it is not in agreement with the proposed penalty, it will have the right to appeal to the Council, at which the staff will present the case again to the Council; and in turn the institution will have the opportunity to present its side of the situation, which I assume would be somewhat comparable procedure at that point.

There is one minor variation at that level, in an effort to reduce the burden on the Council of infraction matters which may yet come by appeal rather than by initial determination of violation and penalty as is presently the case. The Council may act in this fashion by means of subcommittees.

I think, as I said, it is unfortunate that this had not been studied before this.

[Proposal 99 (page A-56) was approved by a show of hands.]

Discipline of Members

Mr. Cross: I think we have already managed to speak to this. I will merely move that No. 100 be approved.

[The motion was seconded.]

[Proposal 100 (page A-56) was approved by a show of hands.]

Infractions Committee

Mr. Cross: Mr. Chairman, I move the approval of Item No. 101.

[The motion was seconded.]

[Proposal No. 101 (page A-57) was approved by a show of hands.]

Mr. President, may I understand it to be that my motion includes that it be effective immediately; and I now also move the approval and adoption by the Convention of Appendix D, which is the detailed procedure, and that that be made effective immediately.

[The motion was seconded.]

Enforcement

Keith Broman (University of Nebraska): Mr. President, you might note that Proposal No. 102 is a modest modification of Appendix D, which I would like to suggest as an amendment to the proposal.

President Ramer: No. 102 has been proposed as an amendment to the motion. Is there a second?

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Cross: I merely say that personally I think it is a desirable thing to express in writing what has been the custom of the committee in the past. I think it is a desirable addition.

[Proposal No. 102 (page A-57) was approved by a show of hands.]

[Appendix D (page A-68) was approved as amended by a show of hands.]

16. EXECUTIVE REGULATIONS

President Ramer: We will return now to the agenda for Saturday afternoon, January 13. We have completed our attention to the formal amendments. Under Other Business we need to give recognition to the Executive Regulations, you will find immediately following Proposal No. 102. I might add that these are decisions that have been reached by our Executive Committee and stand as approved until contested from the floor.

There is one amendment I think that should be added, namely the proposal of the Executive Committee, 2-4-(d) of the Executive Regulations, that this be changed to eliminate the restriction against women. This would be achieved by the removal of the word "male." No action on this is necessary unless it needs to be contested on the floor of the convention.

Now I assume the approval of these Executive Regulations, you will find under Appendix B, as amended, unless I hear objection from the floor.

Max Schultze (University of Minnesota, Twin Cities): Mr. Chairman, I refer the Convention's and your attention, Mr. Chairman, to Item No. 106 which deals with Club Sports. As I understand it, this Executive Regulation proposal stems from a ruling which was published in the NCAA News in response to a question that was addressed I believe to the executive office.

I regret very much to find this policy spelled out as an executive regulation because what it in fact does is deprive students who participate in club sports that are not sponsored by the intercollegiate athletic department from the opportunity to compete in NCAA-sponsored events. I think we are going in the wrong direction when we are trying to encourage and to broaden participation.

This executive regulation, for instance, would make it impossible for a boy who is a good long-distance skier, let's say, at Minnesota or one of the other institutions—we do not have skiing as a varsity sport—to be entered in NCAA events, even though he would comply with all the eligibility requirements governing individual competition,

or if there were such an item that could govern team events.

I would suggest to the convention, Mr. Chairman, that this particular item No. 106 be disapproved by the Convention, with the suggestion that the proper legislation be submitted to the membership next year so that people participating in club sports can also be certified as being eligible for NCAA events. Thank you very much.

Stanley J. Marshall (South Dakota State University): Chairman Bill Baughn, of the Long Range Planning Committee, asked me to comment on No. 106. This problem came before the Long Range Planning Committee several years ago. We have discussed it many times. The feeling is that club sports should be sponsored by the intercollegiate department or the department that is responsible for intercollegiate athletics. We strongly encourage them to do that, and not permit the development of several programs on a campus. Essentially we are responsible for intercollegiate athletics, and the Long Range Planning Committee did recommend No. 106. I trust that you will permit it to continue to be in operation.

President Ramer: Thank you, Stan. Dr. Schultze, did you move for a reconsideration of this by the Convention?

Mr. Schultze: I move, Mr. Chairman, that the Convention disapprove this executive regulation No. 106.

[The motion was seconded.]

[Motion to disapprove No. 106 (page A-60) was defeated by a show of hands.]

John Eller (East Stroudsburg State College): I move that the traveling parties for the College Division Soccer Championships as contained in Proposal No. 107 be referred to the NCAA Soccer Rules and Tournament Committee and the NCAA Executive Committee for further study and consideration of raising the limit from 16 to 20 for expense purposes.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Chairman, just for your information, by rule, soccer is only allowed to have 16 people participating in a contest; so if you add four more people, it would allow a coach, possibly an assistant coach, a manager and a trainer. I do not think this is out of line, particularly in view of the fact the University Division is already allowed 20 for expense purposes and the College Division has been listed as 18.

[Motion to refer No. 107 (page A-60) for further study was approved by a show of hands.]

17. OTHER BUSINESS

President Ramer: Now we move to the item in the agenda concerned with Other Business.

Edward W. Malan (Pomona-Pitzer Colleges): Mr. President, may I rise to a point of personal privilege?

I rise only to suggest that I have over the course of the last 10 years experienced a good deal of confusion not with regard to the fundamental purposes and policies of the NCAA but their implementation.

We have re-enforced in this Convention a restriction on the participation of those student-athletes who happen to play football. We have re-enforced limitations on the participation of those student-athletes who happen to play basketball. We have liberalized those who happen to play soccer. We have restricted those who play base-

ball in season but have in past conventions liberalized their participation out of season.

I simply want to request the Council, whether as presently constituted or as sometime in the future perhaps reconstituted, to review what our fundamental purposes and policies are and how they should be implemented in terms of trying to deal with the several sports.

I think we find ourselves fragmented by dealing with one sport at a time on separate occasions. I would simply request that that action be taken.

President Ramer: As your presiding officer, I would like to request that the proposal or suggestion from Pomona-Pitzer College be referred to the Council and be given attention at the earliest opportunity.

Are there other matters to come before this convention under the heading of Other Business?

Jesse Hill (Pacific Coast Athletic Association): Mr. President, you mentioned something about women in athletics in executive regulations. I would like to know what this is all about.

President Ramer: The executive regulations, in that one point there is restriction of participation to male participants. That is the only place we can find in which that restriction is provided.

Our Secretary reminds me that you will find this in Executive Regulation 2-(4)-(d), the second line, and I will read this section: "The games committee conducting any NCAA event shall limit participation to eligible male student-athletes and may limit the number of entries," and so on.

This is the only reference, Jesse, that we know of presently to the restriction; and the Executive Committee has proposed the elimination of this particular restriction.

Mr. Hill: Does the Executive Committee propose to include women competing in NCAA championships?

President Ramer: The Executive Committee is making no proposal here, only a negative one. That is the removal of the present restriction. We have been counseling closely with our legal staff on this matter, and we have been advised to include this in our revisions.

Mr. Hill: What will be the policy?

President Ramer: I assume this would be left to the local conferences and institutions. You are under no restriction as far as the national level is concerned, Jesse; so let your conscience be your guide.

Mr. Hill: I think most schools and conferences have been relying on the NCAA to handle this.

President Ramer: I suspect that is true. I am delighted for once that we are in the position of becoming less restrictive and not more restrictive.

We all share your concern very much, and I might add that I think we can recognize that the taking of this kind of negative action in no way acquits our institutional representatives from some responsibility in inquiring into this important question of women's participation.

Robert M. Whitelaw (Eastern College Athletic Conference): Mr. President, I would like to offer to the membership the following general statement:

The Eastern College Athletic Conference membership has been vitally concerned and strongly, and I wish to emphasize strongly, about the position that the NCAA has taken regarding the U. S. Olympic Committee. It must be reorganized to provide proper representation of the schools and colleges throughout the country.

As commissioner of the ECAC, I have been directed by our council and its membership to comment upon the action of the NCAA Council in withdrawing from USOC membership on October 25, 1972.

Since the ECAC is composed of 206 NCAA members and is therefore the largest NCAA affiliate, we feel our reaction to this decision is of sufficient importance to communicate it to the NCAA membership at this time. We may be well speaking for other NCAA members.

There are certain basic facts which must be made clear before our reaction can be properly understood. Following is a concise statement of these points:

1. The NCAA was a Group B member of the USOC before its withdrawal.

2. The ECAC was a Group C member of the USOC prior to the NCAA's withdrawal.

3. Under Article 3, Section 3 of the USOC Constitution, one of the basic requirements for the ECAC membership and its voting privileges on USOC matters was affiliation with a member of Group A or Group B. Disaffiliation of such membership by the NCAA, therefore, automatically terminated the membership of the ECAC.

4. The NCAA Executive Council, as a result of its meeting on October 25, 1972, and without any prior notice to the ECAC or the NCAA membership of its intention to do so, officially withdrew the NCAA from membership.

5. There was no opportunity for discussion of this decision made available to the ECAC or the NCAA membership. The ECAC is keenly disappointed with the timing and manner in which the NCAA Council undertook this action.

I think there is a problem here as to the scope and definition of the authority delegated to the NCAA Council to act in behalf of the NCAA membership in periods between conventions on matters of such major significance.

Therefore, we request of the officers of the NCAA to appoint a committee to review our concern as expressed in this statement and draft appropriate legislation to contemplate the NCAA's future authority as it might relate to issues of decisions of similar magnitude.

President Ramer: I assume your motion is to convey this statement to the NCAA Council. Am I correct?

Mr. Whitelaw: It is just a statement. That is correct. I hope you take it under consideration.

[There was a second.]

Charles Neinas (Big Ten Conference): Mr. Chairman, I don't rise to speak in opposition to the motion that it be referred to the Council, but I do rise to make some comments.

First, I think we should publicly commend you, Mr. Chairman, for the manner in which you have handled this very complex convention. I think that you have been fair enough our coaches would even accept you as an official on the road. [Laughter and applause]

The matter of the NCAA's involvement in the United States Olympic

Committee and other international sports federation has been documented in some detail on numerous occasions.

One only has to review the annual reports submitted by various bodies of this organization, including the Council, to read of the displeasure of the school-college community with the operation of the United States Olympic Committee.

As recently as last January, it was reported by the NCAA Olympic Committee, subsequently replaced by the International Relations Committee, that the NCAA was considering dedicating its efforts to the support of the World University Games Movement.

Many of you received the document entitled "Continuing Crisis in the Olympics." It has also appeared in installments in the NCAA NEWS.

The NCAA International Relations Committee consists of nine people who have had over 80 years of experience in dealing with the USOC in some capacity or another. None of the gentlemen on the NCAA International Relations Committee has aspired to any office or position within the USOC. We have purposely sought the advice and counsel of others, including former Olympic athletes and those outside the school-college administrative sphere who are interested in the Olympic Committee.

Our mission is simple. We don't believe the USOC as it presently is operated and constituted, adequately represents amateur athletes in the United States. As a result we are not getting the best effort from our amateur athletes in Olympic competition.

This was our recommendation to the NCAA Council. The Council heard it, studied it and voted upon it. I think the Council should be commended for its action. [Applause]

Michael Fleischer (Herbert H. Lehman College): I would like just to say I don't believe anyone disagrees with what Mr. Neinas has said. The facts are there. I don't think anyone is happy with the way the United States Olympic Committee has been operating. I think we will agree it is in vital need of reform. I think the point is, though, on such a large matter it seemed to many of us the Council could have waited to bring the matter in front of the Convention to get the feeling of all our members. Why this action at this time when we still have almost four years before the next Olympics, time to reform, time to make our movement?

Again, we are not against what the Council has done, except in the principle as to how they went about doing it without consulting the rest of the membership. It wouldn't have gotten on the floor except for this motion.

I think decisions like this should be brought to the membership to get some feeling from the entire membership.

[Motion to refer the ECAC statement to the Council was approved by a show of hands.]

18. REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

Karl Kurth, Jr. (Trinity College): May I direct the attention of the delegates to the names of your representatives who served as duly appointed members of the Committee on Committees. On their behalf, I should like to express appreciation for the opportunity to serve the Association in this capacity and to record our gratitude to Miss Fanny Vaughn for her invaluable assistance.

At our regularly scheduled meeting on January 10 and in accordance with the Bylaws of the Association, full consideration was given to all eligible nominees duly presented for existing vacancies on the committees under our purview.

Please refer to the Committee's report circulated earlier during this session. The three Volleyball Tournament nominees appear in error. Kindly strike all three from this report.

The nominees as distributed and corrected are hereby presented to the Convention for election to committee for terms as indicated.

Mr. President, I move acceptance of the Committee's nominees, please.

[The motion was seconded.]

[The motion was approved by a show of hands.]

Earl C. Lory (University of Montana): Mr. Chairman, may I make an editorial change? On the Skiing Committee, Russell Lyon is a skiing coach at the University of Montana, not Montana State University.

19. REPORT OF THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE

Louis A. Myers (University of Arizona): Mr. Chairman and Delegates: The unanimous recommendations of the Committee for the offices of President, Secretary-Treasurer and members of the Council for which vacancies exist are as follows:

For President of our Association—

Alan J. Chapman, Rice University

For Secretary-Treasurer—

Richard P. Koenig, Valparaiso University

For Vice-President, District 2—

Ernest C. Casale, Temple University

For Vice-President, District 4—

John A. Fuzak, Michigan State University

For Vice-President, District 5 (to fill the unexpired term of

Wade Stinson)—

Stanley J. Marshall, South Dakota State University

For Vice-President, District 6—

Neils Thompson, University of Texas

For Vice-President, District 8—

George F. Ilg, Fresno State College

For Vice-President-at-Large (to fill the unexpired term of

Richard Koenig, our nominee for Secretary-Treasurer)—

Ross H. Smith, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

For Council Member-at-Large—

J. William Orwig, Indiana University

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the Nominating Committee, I move the acceptance of this report and the election of these nominees.

[The motion was seconded.]

[The motion was approved by a show of hands.]

President Ramer: I take great pleasure at this time in turning the gavel over to our new President, Dr. Alan Chapman of Rice University. [Applause]

Alan, on behalf of all of us, we welcome you into this new position. I can express only my hope that you have the fullest kind of cooperation I have had, and I know you will have it.

[Mr. Chapman assumed the chair.]

President-Elect Chapman: I know that speeches at this time of day are not in order. Let me say I approach this position with a combination of apprehension and delight—apprehension as to whether I can serve the Association well and delight because it gets me off the Committee on Academic Testing and Requirements. [Laughter]

I just hope we will be able to serve you well. We will call on several of you to help us, and I know that you will respond.

I don't think we should adjourn without once more expressing the appreciation of the entire Association for the leadership that Earl Ramer has given us for the last two years. [The assembly arose with prolonged applause]

I would like to ask Dick Koenig to come to the stand and contribute anything he has. [Applause]

Secretary-Elect Koenig: Mr. President, I am going to follow your example, not only during the next year but right now in keeping my comments very brief. I am going to say I am no story teller, like Sam, but I hope I can do half the job that he did.

I think you should all join me in saying thanks to Sam for the job which he did. [The assembly rose and applauded.]

President-Elect Chapman: I presume there is no other business. I just want to remind the new Council members there is a meeting at 9 o'clock tomorrow morning in Private Dining Room No. 8.

If there is no other business I will declare this Convention adjourned.

[The Convention adjourned at 4:35 p.m.]

Appendix A

67th ANNUAL CONVENTION

LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS SCHEDULED FOR VOTE ON THURSDAY MORNING, JANUARY 11

[Note: In the following proposals, those letters and words which appear in *italics* are to be deleted and those letters and words which appear in **bold face** are to be added. All proposals shall become effective August 1, 1973, unless otherwise indicated. All page numbers listed refer to the corresponding pages in the 1972-73 NCAA Manual.]

TRANSFER OF MEMBERSHIP

No. 1. Bylaws: Amend Article 6, Section 4-(c), page 61, as follows:

"Section 4. Transfer of Membership. The following transfer of active members from their *regular natural* geographic districts is hereby made in accordance with Constitution 5-4:

"(c) From District 3 to District 5
Louisville, University of, Louisville, Kentucky
Memphis State University, Memphis, Tennessee"

Source: Memphis State University.

Intent: To transfer its membership from District 3 to District 5 for purposes of conference affiliation; effective immediately.

Action: Withdrawn.

COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN

No. 2. Bylaws: Amend Article 7, Sections 1-(a)-(5), 2-(a)-(5), 3-(a)-(8) and 4-(a)-(6), pages 63-73, as follows:

"One member of each committee shall be elected chairman by the annual Convention. *and may so serve during his first term and no more than three years thereafter which may extend beyond the end of his second term.*"

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To limit the terms of committee chairmen to the same length as those of committee members; effective immediately.

Action: Approved by voice vote.

COMPETITIVE SAFEGUARDS COMMITTEE

No. 3. Bylaws: Amend Article 7, Section 1-(c), page 63, as follows:

"(c) The Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports shall consist of six members.

"(3) The Committee shall disseminate such information as might appropriately be brought to the attention of the Association's membership and *recommend the establishment of* **adopt recommended** policies and standards designed to further the above objectives."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To authorize the Committee to promulgate recommended

standards for the safe conduct of intercollegiate sports; effective immediately.

Action: Approved by voice vote.

COMMITTEES

No. 4. Bylaws: Amend Article 7, Section 2, page 65, by adding a new paragraph (b) and relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

"(b) The Executive Committee of the Association shall be empowered to appoint the following committees and any other special committees it deems necessary for the conduct of an annual or special Convention of the Association:

Credentials Memorial Resolutions Voting

"(1) The members of the aforementioned committees shall be appointed for one-year terms; they shall be on the staff of an active or allied member of the Association, and their terms shall commence on a date determined by the Executive Committee and shall conclude upon Convention adjournment.

"(2) One member of each committee shall be appointed chairman."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To formalize existing procedures; effective immediately.

Action: Approved by voice vote.

COMMITTEES

No. 5. Bylaws: Amend Article 7, Section 2, page 69, by adding paragraphs (x) and (y), as follows:

"(x) The Memorial Resolutions Committee shall be responsible for compiling the names of those individuals associated with intercollegiate athletics who passed away during the year immediately previous to the annual Convention. The Committee shall make its report each year, memorializing the individuals involved, during the Opening Business Session of the annual Convention.

"(y) The Voting Committee shall be responsible for counting ballots at the annual Convention when called upon by the President of the Association. One member shall be appointed from each NCAA district and the chairman shall be appointed at-large."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To formalize existing procedures; effective immediately.

Action: Approved by voice vote.

DRUG EDUCATION COMMITTEE

No. 6. Bylaws: Amend Article 7, Section 2, page 69, by adding a new paragraph (z), as follows:

"(z) The Drug Education Committee shall be responsible for supervising the Association's drug education program."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To establish the Drug Education Committee as a standing committee; effective immediately.

Action: Approved by voice vote.

TRACK AND FIELD COMMITTEE

No. 7. Bylaws: Amend Article 7, Section 3-(d), page 71, as follows:

"(d) The Track and Field Rules and Meet Committee shall consist of fifteen thirteen members and shall be constituted as follows:

"(1) One member from each of the eight geographic districts;

"(2) Four members-at-large, one of whom shall be elected from a College Division member located in Districts One through Four, one from a College Division member located in Districts Five through Eight and one elected secretary-rules editor; and

"(3) One member who shall represent junior college track and field interests, and

"(4) Two members who shall represent secondary school track and field interests.

"(Note: Effective September 1, 1974, the number of at-large representatives shall be reduced to three and the Committee's membership shall be reduced to twelve.)"

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To accommodate the desire of the National Federation of State High School Associations to promulgate separate playing rules in track and field, effective immediately, and, after one year, reduce the Committee membership to 12, consistent with the Association-approved multiple-of-three formula.

Action: Approved by voice vote.

SOCCER COMMITTEE

No. 8. Bylaws: Amend Article 7, Section 3-(e), page 71, as follows:

"(e) The Soccer Rules and Tournament Committee shall consist of six nine members. One member shall represent junior college soccer interests and one member shall represent secondary school soccer interests. The chairman may designate a secretary-rules editor from among the membership of the Committee."

Source: NCAA Council (Soccer Rules and Tournament Committee).

Intent: To expand the Committee to better meet its responsibilities in tournament management; effective immediately.

Action: Approved by voice vote.

SWIMMING COMMITTEE

No. 9. Bylaws: Amend Article 7, Section 3-(f), page 71, as follows:

"(f) The Swimming Rules and Meet Committee shall consist of fifteen thirteen members and shall be constituted as follows:

"(1) One member from each of the eight geographic districts;

"(2) Four members-at-large, one of whom shall be elected from a College Division member located in Districts One through Four, one from a College Division member located in Districts Five through Eight, and one shall be elected secretary-rules editor, and the fourth shall have expertise in diving, and

"(3) One who shall represent junior college swimming interests, and

"(4) Two who shall represent secondary school swimming interests.

"(Note: Effective September 1, 1974, the number of at-large representatives shall be reduced to three and the Committee's membership shall be reduced to twelve.)"

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To accommodate the desire of the National Federation of State High School Associations to promulgate separate playing rules in swimming, effective immediately, and, after one year, reduce the Committee membership to 12, consistent with the Association-approved multiple-of-three formula.

Action: Approved as amended (see No. 109).

WRESTLING COMMITTEE

No. 10. Bylaws: Amend Article 7, Section 3-(g), page 71, as follows:

"(g) The Wrestling Rules and Tournament Committee shall consist of *fifteen* twelve members and shall be constituted as follows:

"(1) One member from each of the eight geographic districts, except District Six;

"(2) *Three* Four members-at-large, one of whom shall be elected from a College Division member located in Districts One through Four, one from a College Division member located in Districts Five through Eight and *the third* one elected secretary-rules editor; and

"(3) One member who shall represent junior college wrestling interests. and

"(4) Four members who shall represent secondary school wrestling interests."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To accommodate the desire of the National Federation of State High School Associations to promulgate separate playing rules in wrestling, effective immediately, and expand the Committee membership to 12, consistent with the Association-approved multiple-of-three formula.

Action: Approved by voice vote.

BASEBALL COMMITTEE

No. 11. Bylaws: Amend Article 7, Section 3-(m), page 72, as follows:

"(m) The Baseball Rules and Tournament Committee shall consist of *twelve* thirteen members and shall be constituted as follows:

"(1) One member from each of the eight geographic districts; and

"(2) Four members-at-large, one of whom shall be elected from a College Division member located in Districts One through Four, one from a College Division member located in Districts Five through Eight and one elected secretary-rules editor, and

"(3) One member who shall represent junior college baseball interests.

"(Note: Effective September 1, 1974, the number of at-large representatives shall be reduced to three, and the Committee's membership shall be reduced to twelve.)"

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To add a junior college representative to the Committee, effective immediately, and, after one year, reduce the Committee's membership to 12, consistent with the Association-approved multiple-of-three formula.

Action: Approved by voice vote.

VOLLEYBALL COMMITTEE

No. 12. Bylaws: Amend Article 7, Section 4-(i), page 73, as follows:

"(i) The Volleyball Tournament Committee shall consist of *six* three members."

Source: NCAA Council (Executive Committee).

Intent: To conform Committee size to the number of tournament responsibilities and assignments.

Action: Approved by voice vote (effective immediately).

AMENDMENTS

No. 13. Constitution: Amend Article 7, page 27, as follows:

"This Constitution may be amended at any annual or special Convention by a two-thirds majority of the delegates present and voting; provided that the proposed amendment shall have been submitted in writing to the Secretary of the Association by November 15 preceding the an annual Convention or sixty days preceding a special Convention. The Secretary shall mail a copy of the proposed amendment to all members of the Association not later than December 1 before the an annual Convention or forty-five days preceding a special Convention. A proposed amendment to the Constitution may be amended at the a Convention by a majority of the members present and voting provided that the amendment to the proposed amendment does not increase the modification of the constitutional provision to be amended, and provided further that the amendment to the proposed amendment shall have been submitted in writing to the Secretary prior to one o'clock in the afternoon on the day preceding the final business session of the a Convention. The Secretary shall prepare copies of the amendment to the proposed amendment for distribution before or during the business session of the a Convention. The Council, however, after deliberation may propose amendments to amendments at the time of the Convention without meeting the procedural requirements described in this Article provided that in each instance the proposed amendment to an amendment has been approved by two-thirds of the Council and copies are distributed before or during the business session of the a Convention. Unless otherwise specified, all amendments shall become effective on the first day of August following adoption by the Convention."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To confirm that the Association may adopt legislation at a special Convention and to establish deadlines for submission and distribution of proposed amendments; effective immediately.

Action: Approved 307-22.

AMENDMENTS

No. 14. Bylaws: Amend Article 8, page 74, as follows:

"These Bylaws may be amended at any annual or special Convention by a majority of the delegates present and voting provided that the proposed amendment shall have been submitted in writing to the Secretary of the Association by November 15 preceding ~~the an annual Convention or sixty days preceding a special Convention.~~ The Secretary shall mail a copy of the proposed amendment to all members of the Association not later than December 1 before ~~the an annual Convention or forty-five days preceding a special Convention.~~ A proposed amendment to the Bylaws may be amended at ~~the a~~ Convention by a majority vote of the members present and voting provided that the amendment to the proposed amendment does not increase the modification of the Bylaw provision to be amended, and provided further that the amendment to the proposed amendment shall have been submitted in writing to the Secretary prior to one o'clock in the afternoon on the day preceding the final business session of ~~the a~~ Convention. The Secretary shall prepare copies of the amendment to the proposed amendment for distribution before or during the business session of ~~the a~~ Convention. The Council, however, after deliberation may propose amendments to amendments at the time of ~~the a~~ Convention without meeting the procedural requirements described in this Article provided that in each instance the proposed amendment to an amendment has been approved by two-thirds of the Council and copies are distributed before or during the business session of ~~the a~~ Convention. Unless otherwise specified, all amendments shall become effective on the first day of August following adoption by the Convention."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To confirm that the Association may adopt legislation at a special Convention and to establish deadlines for submission and distribution of proposed amendments; effective immediately.

Action: Approved by voice vote.

67th ANNUAL CONVENTION

LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS SCHEDULED FOR VOTE ON FRIDAY AFTERNOON, JANUARY 12

[Note: In the following proposals, those letters and words which appear in *italics* are to be deleted and those letters and words which appear in **bold face** are to be added. All proposals shall become effective August 1, 1973, unless otherwise indicated. All page numbers listed refer to the corresponding pages in the 1972-73 NCAA Manual.]

MEMBERSHIP DIVISIONS

No. 15. Constitution: Amend Article 4, Section 3, page 18, as follows:

"Section 3. **Classes and Divisions of Membership.** Membership shall be of the following classes: active, allied, associate and affiliated. **The Bylaws may prescribe the procedure whereby the active and allied membership of the Association may be divided into divisions for purposes of Bylaw legislation and competition in NCAA Championship meets and tournaments.**"

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To confirm authority for the present competitive divisions and provide for legislative divisions within the membership of the Association; effective immediately.

Action: Defeated 218-224.

DIVIDED VOTING

No. 16. Constitution: Amend Article 6, Section 1-(a), page 25, as follows:

"Section 1. (a) The Association may at any annual Convention adopt or amend any Bylaws not inconsistent with the provisions of the Constitution by a majority vote of the members present and voting, except where a greater majority may be required by the Bylaws. **The Bylaws may be adopted or amended by vote of membership divisions within the Association as prescribed by the Bylaws.**"

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To provide for legislative divisions within the Association; effective immediately.

Action: Not considered by the Convention.

QUORUM

No. 17. Constitution: Amend Article 5, Section 6-(c), page 24, as follows:

"(c) One hundred active **and allied** members represented as prescribed in this Constitution shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business of the Association. **For purposes of voting by membership divisions as prescribed by the Bylaws, forty members of each division shall constitute a quorum.**"

Source: University of Tennessee, Knoxville; District of Columbia Teachers College.

Intent: To define a quorum for Bylaw voting by divisions and to include allied members in the minimum requirements; effective immediately.

Action: Not considered by the Convention.

MEMBERSHIP DIVISIONS

No. 18. Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 6, page 53, as follows:

"Section 6. Institutional Eligibility. The NCAA sponsors twenty-six National Collegiate Championships of which seventeen are National Collegiate Championship events for Division I and nine are National College Division Championship events for Division II. (The listing of these events is contained in Bylaw 5-1, page 58.) To be eligible to enter a team or individual in NCAA championship competition, an institution must be an active member in good standing and be eligible under the rules of the intercollegiate athletic conference of which it is a member, provided the conference is an allied member of the Association.

"(a) A member institution, through process of institutional self-determination in accordance with Bylaw 6-3, shall designate certify its athletic program as either University Division or College Division for competition qualification for membership within one of the two membership divisions: Division I or Division II. Its designation shall determine its eligibility in the nine sports in which the NCAA sponsors a national championship in both divisions. A Division I member shall be eligible to enter only Division I Championships and a Division II member shall be eligible to enter only Division II Championships, except that:

"(1) An institution which does not qualify for Division I may elect to compete in National Collegiate Division I Championships in not more than two sports while maintaining institutional membership in Division II; or

"(2) An institution which does not qualify for Division I may petition the NCAA Council to be designated as Division I in the sport of football and, if the petition is approved, the institution may elect to compete in a National Collegiate Division I Championship in one sport while maintaining institutional membership in Division II, and

"(3) The student-athletes of a Division II member who finish among the first three in an event within a Division II championship may qualify for competition in that event in the Division I championship. (This provision refers to Division II championships in the sports of cross country, golf, gymnastics, swimming, tennis, outdoor track and wrestling.)

[Eliminate present B4-6-(a)-(1) and (2).]

"(4) The active members of both divisions shall be eligible for NCAA championships in those sports in which there is not Division I and Division II national competition, i.e., fencing, ice hockey, lacrosse, skiing, indoor track, volleyball and water polo."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To prescribe conditions of institutional eligibility for Division I and II Championships conducted by the Association.

Effective Date: For voting purposes, immediately; for purposes of championship competition, August 1, 1973.

Action: Not considered by the Convention.

MEMBERSHIP CRITERIA

No. 19. Bylaws: Amend Article 6, page 61, by adding a new Section 3 and renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

"Section 3. Membership Divisions. There shall be two divisions of active and allied members: Division I and II.

"(a) Division I shall consist of those active members which:

"(1) Conduct a varsity intercollegiate program in at least eight of the sports in which the Association sponsors national championship competition or establishes and maintains rules of play in the sport, with at least one sport in each of the three sports seasons of the academic year;

"(2) Conduct a major program in the sports of football and basketball, or in the sports of football or basketball and one additional sport in which the Association sponsors a National Collegiate Championship, and

"(3) Schedule at least fifty per cent of their varsity intercollegiate competition in football and basketball with members of Division I, or if only one of these two sports is conducted on a varsity intercollegiate basis, then at least fifty per cent of their varsity intercollegiate competition in that sport with members of Division I."

"O.I. 600. For the purposes of dividing the membership between Division I and Division II upon adoption of Bylaw 6-3, a program in football and basketball shall be considered 'major' if it was classified as major by the appropriate NCAA Statistics and Classification Committee as of December 1, 1972. A program in a sport other than football or basketball in which the Association conducts a National Collegiate Championship shall be considered 'major' if at least once in the last four academic years (i.e., 1968-69, 1969-70, 1970-71, 1971-72), the institution has appeared in at least one game in the National Collegiate team championship of that sport (exclusive of basketball) or has had at least one student-athlete win a medal in an individual event of a National Collegiate Championship. The 'team' championships referred to are the National Collegiate Championships in baseball, ice hockey, lacrosse, soccer, volleyball and water polo. The 'individual event' championships referred to are the National Collegiate Championships in cross country, fencing, golf, gymnastics, skiing, swimming, tennis, indoor track, outdoor track and wrestling."

"O.I. 601. In the event an active member does not meet the criteria of Bylaw 6-3-(a)-(2), but is a member of an allied conference in which at least fifty per cent of the members qualify for Division I, such member shall qualify for Division I provided it meets the criteria of Bylaw 6-3-(a)-(1) and Bylaw 6-3-(a)-(3)."

"(b) Allied members whose membership is made up of institutions which are members of Division I also shall be members of Division I.

"(c) Division II shall consist of those active members which:

"(1) Do not qualify for Division I, and

"(2) Conduct a varsity intercollegiate program in at least four of the sports in which the Association sponsors national championship competition or establishes and maintains rules of play in the sport, with at least one sport in each of the three sports seasons of the academic year.

"(d) Allied members whose membership is made up of institutions which are members of Division II also shall be members of Division II.

"(e) Allied members whose membership is made up of institutions which are members of Division I and II shall apply to the Council for membership in the Division it prefers and the Council shall determine the allied member's classification.

"(f) Subsequent to the adoption of these procedures, an active or allied member may request a change of its division. Such request shall be received by the Association's executive director not later than August 1 of the particular year on a form approved by the Council. The Council, subsequent to that August 1 and prior to the following January 1, shall determine, in accordance with the above criteria, if the member's division should be changed. If the Council acts affirmatively on the request by a two-thirds vote of those present and voting, the change shall be effective immediately if the change is from Division I to Division II or effective the following August 1 if the change is from Division II to Division I.

"(g) Each division shall be responsible for determining the NCAA Championships to be established in its division in the sports recognized by the Association as of January 1, 1973. Inauguration of championships in other sports not recognized by the Association as of January 1, 1973, shall require approval by a majority of the members of each division present and voting at a Convention of the Association. [Note: The seventeen sports recognized by the Association as of January 1, 1973, were: baseball, basketball, cross country, fencing, football, golf, gymnastics, ice hockey, lacrosse, skiing, soccer, swimming, tennis, track, volleyball, water polo and wrestling.]

"(h) Institutional membership in a division shall require that the member's vote be counted in that division, where separate divisional voting is applicable, and the member institution shall be governed by the Bylaw legislation which may be adopted by its division, except that for the one or two sports in which a Division II member chooses to compete in Division I, it shall be governed by the requirements of Division I for that sport or sports."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To establish criteria for the two membership divisions; to establish procedures for changing divisions and establishing championship competition; to designate in which division each member shall vote, and the effect of legislation thus adopted.

Effective Date: For voting purposes, immediately; for purposes of championship competition, August 1, 1973.

Action: Not considered by the Convention.

MEMBERSHIP CRITERIA

No. 20. Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 19, as follows:

"Section 3. Membership Divisions. There shall be two divisions of active and allied members: Division I and Division II.

"(a) Division I shall consist of those active members which:

"(1) Conduct a varsity intercollegiate program in at least eight six of the sports in which the Association sponsors national championship competition or establishes and maintains rules of play in the sport, with at least one sport in each of the three sports seasons of the academic year;

"(2) Conduct a major program in the sports of football and basketball, or in the sports of football or basketball and one two additional sports in which the Association sponsors a National Collegiate Championship, and

"(3) Schedule at least fifty per cent of their varsity intercollegiate competition in football and basketball with members of Division I, or if only one of these two sports is conducted on a varsity intercollegiate basis, then at least fifty per cent of their varsity intercollegiate competition in that sport with members of Division I."

Source: University of Miami (Fla.).

Intent: To reduce the number of sponsored sports and to increase the number of "major" sports required (in addition to football or basketball) for Division I membership; effective immediately.

Action: Not considered by the Convention.

MEMBERSHIP CRITERIA

No. 21. Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 19, as follows:

"(h) Institutional membership in a division shall require that the member's vote shall be counted in that division, where separate divisional voting is applicable, and the member institution shall be governed by the Bylaw legislation which may be adopted by its division, except that for the one or two sports in which a Division II member chooses to compete in Division I, it shall be governed by the requirements of Division I for that sport or sports, as well as any more stringent requirements which may be adopted by Division II for that sport or sports.

Source: Missouri Valley Conference.

Intent: To require members of Division II to apply the more stringent requirements of each division in the sport or sports in which they elect to compete in Division I; effective immediately.

Action: Not considered by the Convention.

VOTING AND AMENDMENTS

No. 22. Bylaws: Amend Article 8, page 74, as follows:

"Section 1. These Bylaws may be amended at any annual Convention by a majority vote of the members (a) The Association may at any Convention adopt or amend any Bylaws not inconsistent with the provisions of the Constitution by a majority vote, respectively, of the members of Division I and Division II present

and voting, provided that the proposed amendment shall have been submitted in writing to the Secretary of the Association by November 15 preceding the Convention. The Secretary shall mail a copy of the proposed amendment to all members of the Association not later than December 1 before the Convention in accordance with the requirements of this Bylaw.

"(b) Each division of the Association may at any Convention, by a majority vote of the members of such division present and voting, adopt or amend any Bylaw provided the new or amended Bylaw is as restrictive or more restrictive than the provisions of the Bylaws in existence at the time of the enactment of this provision (January 1973), subject to the exception in paragraph (c). Determination of which proposals shall be subject to divided voting as indicated in this paragraph shall rest with the Council of the Association.

"(c) Division I shall be responsible for determining the NCAA Championships to be established under the auspices of the Association for Division I members [Bylaw 5-2] and Division II shall be responsible for determining the NCAA Championships to be established under the auspices of the Association for Division II members [Bylaw 5-3] in those sports recognized by the Association.

"(d) All legislation of the Association shall be adopted with the two divisions meeting in joint session at the Convention.

"(e) A proposed amendment to the Bylaws may be amended at the Convention by a majority vote of the qualified members present and voting, provided that the amendment to the proposed amendment does not increase the modification of the Bylaw provision to be amended; and, provided further, that the amendment to the proposed amendment shall have been submitted in writing to the Secretary prior to one o'clock in the afternoon on the day preceding the final business session of the Convention. The Secretary shall prepare copies of the amendment to the proposed amendment for distribution before or during the business session of the Convention. The Council, however, after deliberation, may propose amendments to amendments at the time of the Convention without meeting the procedural requirements described in this Article, provided that in each instance the proposed amendment to an amendment has been approved by two-thirds of the Council and copies are distributed before or during the business session of the Convention.

"(f) Unless otherwise specified, all amendments shall become effective on the first day of August following adoption by the Convention."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Reorganization).

Intent: To establish procedures for divided voting; effective immediately.

Action: Not considered by the Convention.

PILOT DIVISION III CHAMPIONSHIPS

No. 23. Resolution:

"Whereas, the 67th NCAA Convention has approved a plan for

organizing the NCAA membership into Division I and Division II for legislative and competitive reasons;

"Whereas, the NCAA has provided football competition for two divisions within the College Division membership and the Executive Committee has announced this program will continue for two membership classifications within Division II;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that in anticipation of the need, under such a plan, for a meaningful program of National Collegiate Division III Championships, two pilot National Collegiate Division III Championships shall be conducted in the sports of cross country and basketball during the 1973-74 academic year under the jurisdiction of special meet and tournament committees appointed by the NCAA Executive Committee;

"Be It Finally Resolved, that the regular eligibility provisions of the Association shall apply in determining the eligibility of member institutions and student-athletes to compete in these pilot events."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To establish two pilot Division III Championships, provided reorganization is approved.

Action: Not considered by the Convention.

AWARDS

No. 24. Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(g)-(7), page 11, by adding a new paragraph (vi), as follows:

"(vi) Awards for non-collegiate golf tournaments need not be personalized, and they may not exceed \$200 in value for any one tournament."

Source: University of Vermont.

Intent: To permit student-athletes to receive non-personalized awards in amateur golf tournaments up to a total value of \$200 for each tournament; effective immediately.

Action: Defeated 140-234.

AMATEURISM

No. 25. Constitution: Amend O.I. 3, following Constitution 3-1-(d), page 6, as follows:

"A professional team shall be any team which is a member of or affiliated with a recognized professional sports organization, or any organized team which includes among its playing personnel any athlete who currently is under contract to a team which is a member of or affiliated with a professional organization in that sport, or any organized team on which there is an athlete receiving payment of any kind for his participation other than actual and necessary expenses for game trips.

"(a) An all-star team composed of college seniors who are academically eligible to participate shall not be considered a professional team even though one or more team members is under contract to a professional sports organization, provided none of the team members receives compensation for the contest.

"(b) Student-athletes may compete with professional golfers in

pro-am tournaments provided the student does not receive payment of any kind for his participation."

Source: University of Vermont.

Intent: To permit college golfers to compete in pro-am tournaments; effective immediately.

Action: Approved 362-31.

ICE HOCKEY ELIGIBILITY

No. 26. Constitution: Amend O.I. 5, following Constitution 3-1-(d), page 7, as follows:

"Any student-athlete who has participated as a member of in more than three games after January 1 of any hockey season in the Canadian Amateur Hockey Association's major junior A hockey classification shall not be eligible for intercollegiate athletics."

Source: Colorado College; University of Denver; University of Michigan; Michigan Technological University; University of North Dakota; University of Notre Dame; University of Minnesota, Duluth.

Intent: To avoid designating as professionals students who have participated in the CAHA major junior A classification on a tryout basis.

Action: Defeated 18-242.

SUMMER FINANCIAL AID

No. 27. Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(f), page 8, as follows:

"(f) Financial aid, including a grant-in-aid which carries with it a partial work requirement, may be awarded for any term (semester or quarter) during which a student-athlete is in regular attendance. Financial aid may not be provided a student while attending a summer school or a summer term unless he has been in residence a minimum of one academic term during the regular academic year and then such financial aid may be utilized only to attend the awarding institution's summer term or summer school. Financial aid awarded by an institution to a student-athlete shall conform to the rules and regulations of the awarding institution and of that institution's conference, if any. In the event such aid exceeds commonly accepted educational expenses (i.e., tuition and fees; room and board; required course-related supplies and books, and incidental expenses not in excess of fifteen dollars per month) during the undergraduate career of the recipient, it shall be considered 'pay' for participation. In addition, the following practices shall constitute 'pay' for participation in intercollegiate athletics and are expressly prohibited:"

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To apply the same financial aid policies to member institutions which conduct regular summer terms and those which conduct summer schools.

Action: Approved by voice vote.

GRADUATE ELIGIBILITY

No. 28. Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 3-(c), page 12, as follows:

"(c) He is maintaining satisfactory progress toward a baccalaureate or equivalent degree as determined by the regulations of that institution, except that a student-athlete who has received his baccalaureate or equivalent degree and who is enrolled in the graduate or professional school of the institution he attended as an undergraduate may participate in intercollegiate athletics provided he has athletic eligibility remaining and such participation occurs within four five years after initial enrollment in a collegiate institution."

Source: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Intent: To permit graduate students to compete during their fifth year of attendance at a collegiate institution.

Action: Defeated 228-167 (needed two-thirds majority)

OUTSIDE FINANCIAL AID

No. 29. Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 4-(a), page 13, by adding a new paragraph (3), as follows:

"(a) Any student-athlete who receives financial assistance other than that administered by his institution shall not be eligible for intercollegiate competition, except where:

[(1) and (2) remain unchanged.]

"(3) Assistance is awarded through an established and continuing program to aid students and the award is made on the basis of the recipient's past performance and overall record as measured by established criteria of which athletic participation shall not be the major criterion; disbursement of the assistance must be by the member institution for the educational expenses of the recipient in attending that institution which the recipient has selected, and the recipient's choice of institutions shall not be restricted by the donor of the assistance."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To permit a student-athlete to receive outside financial assistance provided the award meets certain criteria.

Action: Approved 261-113.

ORIENTATION PROGRAMS

No. 30. Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 4-(b), page 14, by adding a new paragraph (3), renumbering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

"(3) Institutional programs providing legitimate academic orientation for students in preparation for initial entrance immediately prior to the fall semester or quarter may accept prospective student-athletes provided selection is not connected with a student's athletic ability."

Source: Iowa State University.

Intent: To permit prospective student-athletes to receive institutional

financial aid for participation in pre-term orientation programs.
Action: Defeated 69-312.

ENFORCEMENT

No. 31. Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 6, by adding a new paragraph (e), page 15, as follows:

"(e) Student-athletes, staff members and representatives of athletic interests of a member institution shall cooperate fully with the Association's enforcement program by fully and completely disclosing any relevant information of which they have knowledge when requested by the NCAA Investigative staff, Committee on Infractions or Council."

Source: NCAA Council (Committee on Infractions).

Intent: To make it an institutional responsibility for a student-athlete, institutional staff member or representative of athletic interests to cooperate with the Association's enforcement program; effective immediately.

Action: Defeated by voice vote.

FIVE-YEAR RULE

No. 32. Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 9-(a), page 15, as follows:

"(a) He must complete his seasons of participation within five four calendar years from the beginning of the semester or quarter in which he first registered at a collegiate institution.

"(1) Time spent in the armed services, on official church missions or with recognized foreign aid services of the U.S. Government being excepted shall not be counted in the four years permitted in paragraph (a).

"(2) The Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may approve exceptions to paragraph (a) under the following conditions:

"(i) For student-athletes of the national service academies who have exhausted eligibility in one sport, but wish to compete in another sport or sports in which they have eligibility remaining;

"(ii) For student-athletes awarded an additional season of competition for reasons of hardship;

"(iii) For student-athletes whose participation has been limited by non-athletic reasons and who have been granted additional eligibility by the NCAA Eligibility Committee."

Source: Atlantic Coast Conference.

Intent: To change the five-year rule to four years, but authorize exceptions for valid reasons.

Action: Defeated by voice vote.

HARDSHIP

No. 33. Constitution: Add O.I. 16, following Constitution 3-9-(a), page 15, renumbering subsequent interpretations, as follows:

"O.I. 16. 'Hardship' is that incapacitating condition resulting

from injury or illness sustained prior to the second game, contest or meet of the season which causes the loss of the remainder of that season's participation."

Source: Atlantic Coast Conference.

Intent: To define "hardship" as the term is used in C3-9-(a).

Action: Withdrawn.

FIVE-YEAR RULE

No. 34. Constitution: Add O.I. 16, following Constitution 3-9-(a), page 15, renumbering subsequent interpretations, as follows:

"O.I. 16. If a student-athlete enrolls in a collegiate institution at his first opportunity following completion of any one of the three commitments described in the exceptions to C3-9-(a), the elapsed time will not count toward his five years of eligibility."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To provide an exception for student-athletes who, for a bona fide reason, cannot enter college immediately after completing their obligations under one of the three exceptions indicated.

Action: Approved by voice vote.

SUMMER BASKETBALL

No. 35. Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 9-(c), page 15, as follows:

"(c) He must not participate in any organized, outside basketball competition except during the permissible playing season specified in Bylaw 3, or during the period from June 15 to August 31, unless he obtains written permission from his institution's director of athletics (or the latter's official representative), and he competes on a team in a league approved by the NCAA.

"(1) For a league to be approved, it must conform to the following requirements: (i) no member team shall include on its roster more than one player with intercollegiate eligibility remaining in the sport of basketball from any one college, university or junior college; (ii) no member team shall have on its staff any person associated in any capacity with a college, university or junior college; (iii) no member team shall make any payments for play or expenses directly or indirectly to any player; (iv) all players must limit their competition to one team in one league; (v) no admission shall be charged for any game; (vi) no all-star games of any kind shall be permitted, and (vii) no postseason playoffs or tournaments shall be permitted.

"(2) Such Participation in violation of this provision shall require the member institution to rule the student-athlete ineligible for intercollegiate competition in the sport of basketball. Participation by residents of Puerto Rico in the Superior Basketball League of Puerto Rico is exempted from this ruling. A student-athlete may compete in one game a year involving players from his former high school and its alumni team. The Council shall have authority to waive this provision to permit student-athletes to participate in official Pan American or

Olympic tryouts and competition, or participate in other international competition approved by the Department of State of the U.S. Government and sanctioned by the Council of the Association. Request for Council sanction must be made by the institution at least 30 days prior to that competition."

Source: MacMurray College (National Association of Basketball Coaches).

Intent: To permit summer basketball competition by student-athletes in NCAA-approved leagues.

Action: Defeated 139-248.

OUT-OF-SEASON BASKETBALL

No. 36. Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 9-(c), page 15, as follows:

"An institution shall not permit a student-athlete to represent it in intercollegiate athletic competition unless he meets the following requirements of eligibility:

"(c) He must not participate in any organized, outside basketball competition except during the permissible playing season specified in Bylaw 3; and if his institution's playing season ends before the concluding date of the permissible playing season as defined by the NCAA, then he may not engage in any outside competition following his institution's playing season. Such participation shall require the member institution to rule the student-athlete ineligible for intercollegiate competition in the sport of basketball. Participation by residents of Puerto Rico in the Superior Basketball League of Puerto Rico is exempted from this ruling. A student-athlete may compete in one game a year involving players from his former high school and its alumni team. The Council shall have authority to waive this provision to permit student-athletes to participate in official Pan American or Olympic tryouts and competition, or participate in other international competition approved by the Department of State of the U.S. Government and sanctioned by the Council of the Association. Request for Council sanction must be made by the institution at least thirty days prior to that competition."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To prohibit participation by student-athletes in outside basketball competition after the end of their institution's playing season.

Action: Approved by voice vote.

SOCCER ELIGIBILITY

No. 37. Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 9-(d), page 16, as follows:

"(d) He shall be denied eligibility for intercollegiate soccer competition if, following his enrollment in college and during any year in which he is a member of the intercollegiate soccer squad or team, he competes as a member of any outside soccer team during his intercollegiate soccer season. *or if he competes on any occasion as a member of an outside soccer team which is not ap-*

proved by the Council of this Association. The Council shall have authority to waive this provision to permit student-athletes to participate in official Pan American or Olympic tryouts and competition. A freshman cannot compete in outside competition in the sport of soccer during the intercollegiate season if his institution has a freshman soccer team, or if freshmen are eligible for the varsity. The intercollegiate soccer season shall be the period of time between the opening of the institution's formal freshman or varsity practice and the last regularly scheduled soccer game as well as any postseason intercollegiate soccer competition."

Source: Eastern College Athletic Conference.

Intent: To eliminate the certification program for out-of-season soccer competition and the limitations imposed upon a student-athlete's out-of-season participation.

Action: Approved by voice vote.

ENFORCEMENT

No. 38. Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 9-(e), page 16, as follows:

"(e) He shall be denied eligibility for intercollegiate competition in all sports if (1) he has knowingly and willfully violated Section 4 of this article; (2) he has been guilty of fraudulence in connection with an entrance or placement examination; or (3) he has otherwise exhibited gross dishonesty in evading or violating NCAA regulations; (4) he has declined to fully, completely and honestly disclose relevant information of which he has knowledge when requested by the NCAA investigative staff, Committee on Infractions or Council, or (5) while representing his institution in athletic competition, he has obviously failed to deport himself in accordance with the generally recognized high standards of sportsmanship associated with wholesome competitive sports."

Source: NCAA Council (Committee on Infractions).

Intent: To deny eligibility to a student-athlete who fails to cooperate with the Association's enforcement program, or who fails in an obvious manner to exhibit good sportsmanship; effective immediately.

Action: Parts (4) and (5) considered separately; both defeated by hand votes.

67th ANNUAL CONVENTION

LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS SCHEDULED FOR VOTE ON SATURDAY MORNING, JANUARY 13

[Note: In the following proposals, those letters and words which appear in *italics* are to be deleted and those letters and words which appear in **bold face** are to be added. All proposals shall become effective August 1, 1973, unless otherwise indicated. All page numbers listed refer to the corresponding pages in the 1972-73 NCAA Manual.]

ONE-YEAR AWARDS

No. 39. Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 4-(b), page 13, as follows:

"(b) Where a student's athletic ability is taken into consideration in any degree in awarding him unearned financial aid, **such aid shall not be awarded for a period in excess of one academic year, and such aid combined with that received from the following and similar sources may not exceed commonly accepted educational expenses as defined in Section 1-(f) of this article.**"

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To limit financial aid awards to a period of one year.

Action: Approved by hand vote.

NON-RENEWAL OF AID

No. 40. Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 4-(d), page 14, as follows:

"(d) The renewal of a scholarship or grant-in-aid award shall be made on or before July 1 prior to the academic year it is to be effective. The institution shall promptly notify each student-athlete who received an award the previous academic year and who is eligible to receive an award for the ensuing academic year whether his grant has been renewed or *terminated not renewed*. **In the latter event, the institution also shall inform the student-athlete that if he believes the grant has not been renewed for questionable reasons, he may request, and shall have the opportunity for, a hearing before the institutional agency making the financial aid award. The institution shall have established reasonable procedures for the prompt hearing of such a request.**"

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To require institutional procedures whereby a student-athlete may receive a hearing to contest the decision not to renew his financial aid.

Action: Approved by hand vote.

LIMITATIONS ON FINANCIAL AID AWARDS

No. 41. Constitution: Amend Article 3, section 4, page 13, by adding a new paragraph (e), as follows:

"(e) The Bylaws of the Association may prescribe limitations as to the number of financial aid awards a member institution may

provide to student-athletes. In accordance with the membership divisions described in Article 6 of the Bylaws, such legislation may be applicable only to the membership division which adopts it."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To provide the means whereby limitations on the number of athletically related financial aid awards may be enacted.

Action: Approved as amended (see No. 114) 262-116.

FINANCIAL AID LIMITATIONS

No. 42. Bylaws: Add a new Bylaw 5, page 58, renumbering subsequent Bylaws, as follows:

"Section 1. Squad Limitations. To be eligible to represent his institution in intercollegiate athletic competition, a student-athlete must qualify and be listed as a proper member of the squad of his sport pursuant to the requirements of this Article.

"(a) A player must be counted in accordance with the following Maximum Awards Table if

"(1) He is receiving financial aid* based in any degree upon his athletic ability, or

"(2) He was recruited** and engages in intercollegiate competition as a member of a varsity team.

"(b) A player need not be counted in accordance with the following Maximum Awards Table provided

"(1) He was not recruited and is not receiving any institutional financial aid, or

"(2) He was not recruited and is receiving institutional financial aid as to which there is on file in the office of the director of athletics certification by the faculty athletic representative, the admissions officer and the chairman of the financial aid committee that the student's admission and financial aid were granted without regard in any degree to his athletic ability.

"(c) A member institution shall not make an award of financial aid (for which the recipient's athletic ability is considered in any degree) in excess of the number permitted by the following rules and the applicable Maximum Awards Table:

"(1) In each sport, there shall be an annual limit on the value of the initial financial aid awards which may be made to student-athletes. An initial award is an award made to freshmen, transfer students (from two-year or four-year institutions) and upperclassmen receiving financial aid for the first time.

"(2) In each sport, there shall be an annual limit on the number of additional financial aid awards which may be in effect.

"(3) An award first made to a student-athlete during the season or after the end of his sport's season shall be counted as an initial award for either the current academic year (if the institution's annual limit has not been reached) or the next academic year.

"(4) The following Maximum Awards Tables are applicable to the membership divisions described in Constitution 4-3:

MAXIMUM AWARDS TABLE—DIVISION I

Sport	Maximum Initial Awards Per Year†	Maximum Additional Awards In Effect the Same Year‡
Baseball	6	13
Basketball	6	13
Cross Country/Track	7	16
Fencing	3	5
Football	30	75
Golf	3	5
Gymnastics	4	8
Ice Hockey	7	16
Lacrosse	7	16
Skiing	4	8
Soccer	6	13
Swimming	6	13
Tennis	3	5
Volleyball	3	5
Water Polo	3	5
Wrestling	6	13
Total	104	229

MAXIMUM AWARDS TABLE—DIVISION II

Sport	Maximum Initial Awards Per Year†	Maximum Additional Awards In Effect the Same Year‡
Baseball	4	9
Basketball	4	10
Cross Country/Track	5	11
Fencing	2	4
Football	20	45
Golf	2	4
Gymnastics	3	7
Ice Hockey	5	11
Lacrosse	5	11
Skiing	3	7
Soccer	4	9
Swimming	4	9
Tennis	2	4
Volleyball	2	4
Water Polo	2	4
Wrestling	4	9
Total	71	158

“*—Note 1: The term ‘financial aid’ as used in this Section includes all institutional funds such as scholarships, grants, loans, work-study program assistance, on-campus employment and aid from government or private sources for which the institution is responsible for selecting the recipient or determining the amount of aid, or providing matching or supplementary funds for a previously determined recipient; further, it includes

off-campus employment earnings and other sources of aid during the academic year for which the athletic interests of the institution intercede in behalf of the recipient.

“**—Note 2: A recruited player who is not receiving financial aid, or who is receiving financial aid granted without regard in any degree to his athletic ability, does not have to be counted until he engages in intercollegiate competition related to the varsity program in that sport.

“†—Note 3: A member institution may not provide a student-athlete with financial aid in excess of ‘commonly accepted educational expenses’ as defined and controlled by C3-1-(f) and C3-4. A ‘maximum initial award’ refers to a scholarship, grant-in-aid or comparable financial aid commitment covering ‘commonly accepted educational expenses’ awarded by the institution to a particular student for the first time. Under this legislation, an institution may not award each year a greater number of such initial scholarships or grants-in-aid per sport than the number indicated in this column. A member institution, however, may administer such awards on the basis of an aggregate expenditure. Under this procedure, a member may multiply the value of ‘commonly accepted educational expenses’ at that institution by the number of initial awards permitted for the particular sport and the resulting product is the maximum value of new financial aid awards which the member may provide to qualified student-athletes in that sport. The total number of recipients may exceed the number of initial awards indicated provided the aggregate dollar amount is not exceeded.

“‡—Note 4: In addition to the maximum initial awards in effect, an institution may provide financial aid to other student-athletes in the respective sports provided that the maximum number of additional student-athletes receiving any form of financial aid together with any other countable players as defined in paragraph (a) does not exceed the number in this column.

“(d) A player who is counted in the Maximum Awards Table and competes in football and one or more other sports (including basketball) shall be counted in the sport of football. A player who is counted in the Maximum Awards Table and competes in basketball and one or more other sports (other than football) shall be counted in the sport of basketball. A player in two or more sports (other than football or basketball) shall be counted in one of the sports but need not be counted in the other. If a player changes sports, his initial award shall be counted in the Maximum Initial Awards for his first sport and if he continues to receive financial aid, his award shall be counted against the Maximum Additional Awards in his second sport.

“(e) The member institution’s athletic director shall compile a list of the squad members in each sport on the first day of practice and shall indicate thereon the status of each member in the above categories. Lists shall be available for inspection by an authorized representative of another member institution, the NCAA and, as to members of an allied conference, an authorized representative of the conference. A supplementary list may be

filed to add names of persons not initially on the squad or to indicate a change of status. A student-athlete's name must be on the official institutional list to qualify him to represent his institution in intercollegiate competition."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To establish limitations on the number of athletically related financial aid awards and athletically recruited participants in NCAA recognized sports.

Effective Date: August 1, 1973, for those student-athletes first entering member institutions subsequent to the opening term (semester or quarter) of the 1973-74 academic year.

Action: Divided for consideration; approved as amended (see Nos. 115, 117) by hand vote.

BASKETBALL AWARDS LIMITATIONS

No. 43. Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 42, as follows:

"(4) The following Maximum Awards Tables are applicable to the membership divisions described in Constitution 4-3: Maximum Awards Table—Division I. Basketball. 6 maximum initial awards per year. 13 12 maximum additional awards in effect the same year."

Source: Atlantic Coast Conference; Big Ten Conference; Mid-American Conference; Southern Conference; Western Athletic Conference.

Intent: To lower the awards limitations for Division I basketball.

Action: Approved 224-119.

FOOTBALL AWARDS LIMITATIONS

No. 44. Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 42, as follows:

"(4) The following Maximum Awards Tables are applicable to the membership divisions described in Constitution 4-3: Maximum Awards Table — Division I. Football. 30 35 maximum initial awards per year. 75 80 maximum additional awards in effect the same year."

Source: Big Eight Conference.

Intent: To raise the awards limitations for Division I football.

Action: Defeated by hand vote.

FINANCIAL AID

No. 45. Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 4-(b), page 13, as follows:

"(b) Where a student's athletic ability is taken into consideration in any degree in awarding him unearned financial aid, such aid combined with that received from the following and similar sources may not exceed commonly accepted educational expenses as the amount defined in Section 1-(f) of this Article and the Bylaws. In accordance with the membership divisions described in Article 6 of the Bylaws, such limitations adopted in the Bylaws may be applicable only to the membership division which adopts them."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To provide for further limitations upon the value of financial aid awards, and enable subdivisions (Divisions I and II) of the general membership to enact such limitations.

Action: Approved as amended (see No. 118) 234-96.

DETERMINATION OF FINANCIAL NEED

No. 46. Bylaws: Add a new Bylaw 5, Section 2, page 58, as follows:

"Section 2. Determination of Financial Need. To be eligible to represent his institution in intercollegiate athletic competition, a student-athlete shall not be the recipient of financial aid (for which his athletic ability is considered in any degree) in excess of the permissible maximum amount determined by application of the provisions of this Section.

"(a) Each member institution shall file with the NCAA a statement of its educational equivalent. If the educational equivalent of a member differs between and among divisions of an institution, it shall file a statement of the educational equivalent for each subdivision for which there is enrolled a student-athlete. The educational equivalent is defined as tuition and mandatory fees, room and board at campus rates for double occupancy, required course-related supplies and books (in kind but not in cash) not in excess of \$180 per academic year, and incidental expenses at \$15 per month. Revised statements shall be filed whenever there is a change in the respective amounts, and shall indicate the academic year in which the statement applies.

"(b) A member institution may award tuition and mandatory fees, or part thereof, to a student-athlete without regard to his financial need, but an award shall not cover any other part of his educational equivalent except upon a showing of financial need by the recipient. Upon a showing of such need, the institution may award financial aid to the student-athlete to cover any part of the educational equivalent (in addition to tuition and mandatory fees) which exceeds the student-athlete's calculated Expected Family Contribution.

"(c) When a scholarship or grant-in-aid is awarded to a student and the recipient's athletic ability was considered in any degree in determining the award, such financial aid combined with other aid or income the student may receive from employment during semester or term time, other scholarships or grants-in-aid (including governmental grants for educational purposes) and like sources, together with the computed Expected Family Contribution, shall not exceed the educational equivalent as defined above. Bona fide loans which must be paid in full, not related in any way to the borrower's athletic ability, are not a required component in determining the aid limit.

"(d) The Council shall adopt a formula (see Appendix C) for determining the Expected Family Contribution on the basis of income of the student, his spouse (if any), and his parents (or guardians), excluding wage or salary income of the student.

"(e) The Council shall approve a form (see Appendix D) to

secure information needed to make the calculation of the Expected Family Contribution. The form shall permit explanation of extraordinary situations which the student wishes considered in the calculation. The form shall be submitted to the NCAA, or its designated agent, which shall determine the Expected Family Contribution and advise the student of the figure thus established. The figure shall be revealed to such member institutions as the student directs, and such institutions may offer or award aid as provided above in accordance with the stated figure.

"(f) The information in the form shall be kept confidential by the NCAA, or its designated agent, except to the extent that the information may be material to questions of violation of NCAA requirements.

"(g) In the event of a change of economic circumstances of those whose income is considered in calculating the Expected Family Contribution, the student may secure a new calculation by following the procedure utilized in determining his original calculation. The result of the new calculation shall be similarly revealed. After the student has entered the institution, an award may be increased if a new calculation establishes greater need.

"(h) A member institution may award financial aid on the basis of need established by any other procedure it chooses, provided such aid shall not exceed the maximum amount permitted by the NCAA formula and the institution so certifies to the NCAA.

"(i) The Council may establish such further procedures as it deems desirable, adopt appropriate additional forms, fix fees for supplying forms or providing statements of the calculated Expected Family Contribution, authorize preparation and supplying of instructions on the use of forms or on the procedures and of informational pamphlets and otherwise implement the provisions of this Section. Such acts of the Council may be passed on by the annual Convention in the manner provided for review of interpretations in Constitution 6-2."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To establish procedures for awarding financial aid on the basis of the individual recipient's need.

Effective Date: August 1, 1973, for those student-athletes first entering member institutions subsequent to the opening term (semester or quarter) of the 1973-74 academic year.

Action: Defeated by hand vote.

FINANCIAL NEED

No. 47. Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 46, as follows:

"(b) A member institution may award tuition and mandatory fees, and the monetary difference between the highest and lowest official catalog recorded assessments for room and board at NCAA member institutions, to be computed by the NCAA each year and distributed to the membership, or part thereof, to a student-athlete without regard to his financial need, but an award

shall not cover any other part of his educational equivalent except upon a showing of financial need by the recipient. Upon a showing of such need, the institution may award financial aid to the student-athlete to cover any part of the educational equivalent (in addition to tuition and mandatory fees and the monetary difference between the highest and lowest official catalog recorded assessments for room and board at NCAA member institutions, to be computed by the NCAA each year and distributed to the membership) which exceeds the student-athlete's calculated Expected Family Contribution."

Source: Drake University.

Intent: To provide for a more equitable financial aid program based on need regardless of the variance in board and room costs among NCAA institutions.

Action: Defeated by hand vote.

CANDIDATE'S ACCEPTANCE FORM

No. 48. Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 1, page 31, by inserting new paragraphs (c) and (d) and relettering the present paragraph (c) as (e), as follows:

"(c) No offer of financial aid (for which the recipient's athletic ability is considered in any degree) shall be made to a prospective student-athlete prior to the opening day of classes of his senior year in high school.

"(d) A member institution may follow the procedures established in this Section as to the timing of offers of financial aid and invitations to a prospective student-athlete to participate in its intercollegiate athletic program, and as to acceptance thereof by the prospective student-athlete. No member institution shall violate the quiet periods established by these procedures, but it shall not be required to utilize the procedures. In the event a prospective student-athlete submits his acceptance to a member institution, no member of any other member institution's athletic staff or other representative of athletic interests shall, after such acceptance by the prospective student-athlete, solicit his enrollment or offer financial aid or other inducement to enrollment or provide financial aid in any institution. As among members of an allied conference, its procedures establishing earlier commitment dates than fixed in this Section shall not be controlled by the procedures herein established, and such conference procedures shall not be binding on other NCAA member institutions. The admissions and financial-aid-offer procedures of a member institution need not be modified because of the procedures established in this Section, but such institutional procedures shall not take precedence over an acceptance by a prospective student-athlete submitted to another member institution pursuant to the procedures established by this Section.

"(1) An acceptance form for NCAA-recognized fall sports, approved by the Council, may be mailed to a prospective student-athlete not earlier than the end of the Friday nearest to March 1 (i.e., Saturday A.M.). The institution shall not initially mail acceptance forms in excess of the permissible number of

awards which may be prescribed by the Bylaws.

"(2) The institution shall be committed to the financial aid offered in the acceptance form if the prospective student-athlete returns the form, properly executed, by mail postmarked not later than the second Monday following the mailing date. If the acceptance form is mailed to the member institution after the return date, the institution shall promptly determine whether to reaffirm the offer of financial aid, and shall notify the prospective student-athlete within 10 days after receipt of his acceptance of its original offer.

"(3) The same provisions under paragraphs (1) and (2) shall apply for all other sports except that the mailing to the prospective student-athlete shall not be earlier than the end of the Friday nearest to May 1 (i.e., Saturday A.M.) and the return date shall be the second Monday following the mailing date.

"(4) No contact with a prospective student-athlete shall be initiated by a member of an institution's athletic staff or other representative of athletic interests during a quiet period beginning twenty-four hours before the earliest permissible mailing date (i.e., Friday A. M.) and ending at midnight of the second Monday following the mailing date.

"(5) If after the initial mailing of acceptance forms to prospective student-athletes the institution has available financial aid awards not yet made, the institution may mail additional acceptance forms at any time until August 15. The institution shall be committed to the financial aid so offered if the prospective student-athlete returns the form, properly executed, by mail postmarked not later than two weeks from the date it was mailed to him. The procedure in the event of a later return shall be the same as provided in paragraph (2) with respect to an initial mailing. There shall be no quiet period with respect to acceptance forms mailed after the quiet period of paragraph (4).

"(6) The acceptance form procedure shall not be used between August 15 and the end of the Friday nearest March 1.

"(7) A student-athlete who submits acceptance forms to two or more member institutions shall be ineligible for financial aid (for which the recipient's athletic ability is considered in any degree) or participation in athletics or in organized athletic practice sessions (or individual coaching) at all member institutions.

"(8) A student-athlete who submits an acceptance form to one member institution but attends another member institution shall be ineligible for financial aid (for which the recipient's athletic ability is considered in any degree) or participation in athletics or in organized athletic practice sessions (or individual coaching) at the second institution until he has completed one full academic year, and thereafter he shall be eligible for only two varsity years in each sport in which he competes.

"(9) A student-athlete who attends the institution to which he submitted his original acceptance form, but during the course of his first academic year transfers to a second member institution, shall be ineligible for financial aid (for which the recipient's athletic ability is considered in any degree) or participa-

tion in athletics or in organized athletic practice sessions (or individual coaching) at the second institution until he has completed one full academic year, and thereafter he shall be eligible for only two varsity years in each sport in which he competes. (The acceptance form has no further applicability to the student-athlete following his completion of a full academic year.)

"(10) A prospective student-athlete who submits an acceptance form but does not attend any collegiate institution for at least two full academic years shall be fully released from that acceptance.

"(11) The following rules shall govern the applicability of the candidate's acceptance form to prospective student-athletes who attend junior colleges:

"(a) A student-athlete submits an acceptance form to a member institution, but attends a junior college instead. After attending the junior college for a full academic year, he plans to transfer to a second member institution:

"(i) He shall be obligated to attend the first member institution if that institution reaffirms its original offer of financial aid.

"(ii) If the first institution does not reaffirm its original offer, the student-athlete shall be fully released from that acceptance.

"(iii) If the first institution reaffirms its original offer of financial aid and the student-athlete attends another member institution, he shall be ineligible for financial aid (for which the recipient's athletic ability is considered in any degree) or participation in athletics or in organized athletic practice sessions (or individual coaching) at the second institution until he has completed one full academic year, and thereafter he shall be eligible for only two varsity years in each sport in which he competes.

"(b) A student-athlete submits an acceptance form to a member institution, but attends a junior college instead. After attending the junior college for two full academic years, he plans to transfer to a second member institution:

"(i) He shall be obligated to attend the first member institution if that institution reaffirms its original offer of financial aid.

"(ii) If the first institution does not reaffirm its original offer, the student-athlete shall be fully released from that acceptance.

"(iii) If the first institution reaffirms its original offer of financial aid and the student-athlete attends another member institution, he shall be ineligible for financial aid (for which the recipient's athletic ability is considered in any degree) or participation in athletics or in organized athletic practice sessions (or individual coaching) at the second institution until he has completed one full academic year, and thereafter he shall be eligible for only one varsity year in each sport in which he competes.

"(c) A student-athlete, after completing one full academic

year at a junior college, submits an acceptance form to one member institution but plans to attend another member institution.

"(i) He shall be ineligible for financial aid (for which the recipient's athletic ability is considered in any degree) or participation in athletics or in organized athletic practice sessions (or individual coaching) at the second institution until he has completed one full academic year, and thereafter he shall be eligible for only two varsity years in each sport in which he competes.

"(d) A student-athlete, after completing two full academic years at a junior college, submits an acceptance form to one member institution but plans to attend another member institution:

"(i) He shall be ineligible for financial aid (for which the recipient's athletic ability is considered in any degree) or participation in athletics or in organized athletic practice sessions (or individual coaching) at the second institution until he has completed one full academic year, and thereafter he shall be eligible for only one varsity year in each sport in which he competes.

"(12) A prospective student-athlete who is denied admission or does not qualify for the financial aid stated in his acceptance form (because of non-athletic factors) shall be fully released from that acceptance and the institution shall be fully released from its offer.

"(13) A student may petition the NCAA Council to restore eligibility he may have lost by failure to comply with the foregoing acceptance procedures. The Council may restore his eligibility in whole or in part if it determines: (i) the petitioner's attendance at another institution has not in any way been solicited in violation of the acceptance procedures; (ii) the petitioner has been regularly admitted or is admissible to another identified institution, and (iii) the need for release is occasioned by substantial change of economic circumstances of the petitioner (or his family) significantly affecting availability of financial resources, or by relocation of his family so that it is desirable to attend a nearby institution, or by change of career goals which cannot be adequately served without attendance at a different institution, or the institution to which petitioner submitted his declaration has dropped his sport from its intercollegiate athletic program, or the desire to attend another institution is based upon other compelling reasons (in the judgment of the Council) not significantly of an athletic character.

"(14) The Council may authorize the chief executive officer of an allied athletic conference to act in its stead in restoring eligibility, if all institutions involved are members of that conference; the conference may, in resolving the problem, apply its own rules not in conflict with the provisions of this Section. The Council may authorize the respective executive officers of allied conferences to act jointly in its stead in restoring eligibility, if all institutions involved are members of the respective conferences. In the latter event a member institution may ap-

peal the joint determination of the conference officers to the Council; further, the Council shall act if the respective executive officers' conclusions are irreconcilable.

"(15) The detailed operation for members of an allied conference shall be supervised by the conference unless it declines to do so. All operations not supervised by an allied conference shall be supervised by the NCAA under the direction of the Council in such manner as it determines, including but not limited to directing the NCAA staff act for it, or appointing a special committee to act for it.

"(16) The Council is authorized to utilize a subcommittee to act on questions of restoration of eligibility under this Section, to adopt forms for use by member institutions and specify details to be followed in the use of such forms, and to establish such additional procedures as it deems necessary.

"(17) The Council shall publish and distribute to the members the procedures and implementing rules.

"(18) The procedures established by the Council may be passed on by the annual Convention in the manner provided for review of Interpretations in Constitution 6-2."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To establish procedures for issuance and return of acceptance forms by prospective student-athletes.

Action: Defeated by hand vote.

EMPLOYMENT OF COACHES

No. 49. Constitution: Amend Article 3, by adding a new Section 6, page 14, and renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

"Section 6. Principle Governing Employment of Coaches. The number of persons employed by member institutions for the purpose of coaching intercollegiate sports may be controlled by Bylaws enacted by the Association. Such legislation may be applicable only to the membership division which adopts it."

Source: Atlantic Coast Conference; Big Ten Conference; Mid-American Conference; Missouri Valley Conference; Pacific-8 Conference; Southern Conference; Western Athletic Conference.

Intent: To provide means whereby the membership may adopt restrictions on the number of coaches which may be employed by each member.

Action: Defeated by hand vote.

LIMITATIONS ON NUMBER OF COACHES

No. 50. Bylaws: Add a new Bylaw 6, page 59, as follows:

Section 1. Football Coaching Staff. No member institution may employ more than eight persons on its athletic staff whose primary purpose is the organization and coaching of its intercollegiate football program and the eight individuals may recruit off campus. Three part-time coaches may be employed, but their compensation individually may not exceed the value of commonly accepted educational expenses at that institution. The part-time coaches may not recruit off campus.

Section 2. Basketball Coaching Staff. No member institution may employ more than three persons on its athletic staff whose primary purpose is the organization and coaching of its inter-collegiate basketball program and the three individuals may recruit off campus. One part-time coach may be employed, but his compensation may not exceed the value of commonly accepted educational expenses at that institution. The part-time coach may not recruit off campus.

Source: Atlantic Coast Conference; Big Eight Conference (except football); Big Ten Conference; Mid-American Conference; Missouri Valley Conference; Pacific-8 Conference; Southern Conference; Western Athletic Conference.

Intent: To restrict the number of coaches member institutions may employ in the sports of football and basketball.

Action: Not considered by the Convention.

67th ANNUAL CONVENTION

LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS SCHEDULED FOR VOTE ON SATURDAY, JANUARY 13

[Note: In the following proposals, those letters and words which appear in *italics* are to be deleted and those letters and words which appear in **bold face** are to be added. All proposals shall become effective August 1, 1973, unless otherwise indicated. All page numbers listed refer to the corresponding pages in the 1972-73 NCAA Manual.]

RECRUITING PUBLICITY

No. 51. Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 1-(c), page 31, as follows:

"(c) No member institution shall publicize or arrange publicity of the commitment of a prospective student-athlete to attend the institution or accept its tender of financial assistance other than by *means of a written press release distributed to through its normal media outlets.* **Press conferences, receptions, dinners or similar meetings held for the purpose of making such announcements are expressly prohibited;** further, no member institution shall publicize or arrange publicity of the visit of a prospective student-athlete to the institution's campus."

Source: NCAA Council (Public Relations Committee; Committee on Infractions; Special Recruiting Committee).

Intent: To permit normal publicity but continue the prohibition against elaborate affairs to announce a prospective student-athlete's commitment; further, to prohibit publicizing of a prospective student-athlete's visit to the campus.

Action: Approved by hand vote.

SPORTS CAMPS

No. 52. Bylaws: Amend Article 1, by adding a new Section 8, page 38, as follows:

"**Section 8. Specialized Sports Camps, Coaching Schools and Clinics.** In operating a specialized sports camp, coaching school or sports clinic, a member institution, members of its staff or representatives of its athletic interests shall not employ or give free or reduced admission privileges to a high school or junior college athletic award winner."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Recruiting Committee).

Intent: To restrict the use of sports camps, coaching schools and clinics for recruiting purposes.

Action: Approved by hand vote (effective immediately).

SPORTS CAMPS

No. 53. Bylaws: Amend O.I. 112, following Bylaw 1-3, page 33, as follows:

"O.I. 112. No member of an institution's coaching staff may conduct or participate in any coaching school **or specialized sports**

camp involving a students who have finished classes in the spring after their junior is eligible for admission to a member institution or who has started classes for his senior year in high school."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Recruiting Committee).

Intent: To permit coaches of NCAA member institutions to participate in clinics and specialized sports camps involving high school students between their junior and senior year.

Action: Approved by hand vote (effective immediately).

OFF-CAMPUS ENTERTAINMENT

No. 54. Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 5-(e), page 35, as follows:

"(e) An institution, its alumni or its other friends may provide entertainment for a prospective student-athlete, his parents (or legal guardians) at the institution's campus only. Transporting a prospective student-athlete to any other site for any purpose is not permissible. Further, it is not permissible to entertain other relatives or friends of a prospective student-athlete at any site. A prospective student-athlete visiting a member institution's campus shall live and take his meals as regular students normally do, and his entertainment shall take place on campus. If campus facilities are not available, local commercial facilities may be used, but at a scale comparable to that of normal student life. His entertainment shall take place on campus; however, if on-campus entertainment is not available and it is necessary to entertain a prospective student-athlete off campus, a student host may be provided with a maximum of \$10 for each day of the visit to cover the cost of actual and necessary entertainment expenses. The institution (or representatives of its athletic interests) shall not provide an automobile for his use. No member institution may arrange for or permit excessive entertainment of any prospective student-athlete on the campus or elsewhere. The institution (or representatives of its athletic interests) shall not provide an automobile for his the use of the prospect or a student host."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Recruiting Committee).

Intent: To set forth the amount of cash a student host may be given to entertain a prospective student-athlete if off-campus entertainment is necessary during a campus visit.

Action: Approved by hand vote.

COMPLIMENTARY TICKETS

No. 55. Bylaws: Amend O.I. 122, following Bylaw 1-5, page 37, as follows:

"O.I. 122. A prospective student-athlete may visit a member institution's campus at his own expense as often as he wishes. During such visits, the institution may not pay any expense or provide any entertainment except a maximum of three complimentary admissions to a campus athletic event for the exclusive use of admitting the prospective student-athlete and those persons accompanying him on the visit to the event. Payment of any expenses or providing any entertainment, except as noted, on such a trip shall constitute an expense-paid trip."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Recruiting Committee).

Intent: To restrict the use of complimentary tickets to those accompanying the prospective student-athlete on his visit to the campus.

Action: Approved by hand vote (effective immediately).

RECRUITING CONTACTS

No. 56. Bylaws: Amend O.I. 105, following Bylaw 1-1-(b), page 31, as follows:

"O.I. 105. 'Contact' with a prospect 'at the site of his high school's athletic competition' (high school, college preparatory school or junior college) shall be governed by the following:

"(a) No contact shall be made with such prospect before the competition, during the day of the competition.

"(b) If the prospect reports on call at the direction of his high school coach (or comparable authority) and is to be involved in team activity from that point to the end of the competition (e.g., traveling to an away-from-home game) and this occurs prior to the day of competition, then no contact shall be made from the time the prospect reports until after the competition.

"(c) After the competition has been completed, the 'site' shall be interpreted as the facility in which the competition was conducted and any dressing room or meeting facility utilized in conjunction with the competition. Accordingly, contact shall not be made after the competition at the site until the prospective student-athlete is released by his high school the appropriate institutional authority, he dresses and he departs the dressing and meeting facility.

"(d) If a prospective student-athlete is involved in competition which requires his participation more than one day (e.g., basketball tournament) paragraphs (a) and (b) apply and no contact shall be made during the periods between the prospect's competition until his final contest is complete, he is released by his high school the appropriate institutional authority, he dresses and he departs the dressing room or meeting room facility utilized in conjunction with his final participation in the competition."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To clarify that a prospective student-athlete may not be contacted at the site of his high school, college preparatory school or junior college competition except under certain prescribed conditions.

Action: Approved by hand vote (effective immediately).

AUTOMOBILE TRANSPORTATION

No. 57. Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 5-(d)-(1), page 34, as follows:

"(1) This prohibition shall not apply when a prospective student-athlete travels in an automobile to visit the institution's campus, in which case the institution is permitted to pay the round-trip expense at the same mileage rate it allows for travel by its own personnel even though relatives or friends of the prospect accompany him in the automobile. The automobile cannot be

owned, operated or its use arranged by the institution or any representative of its athletic interests. This shall count as a paid visit for each prospective student-athlete who makes the trip."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To clarify the type of automobile which may be utilized by the prospective student-athlete under this provision.

Action: Approved by hand vote.

ENTERTAINMENT

No. 58. Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 5-(d)-(3), page 35, as follows:

"(3) In all instances, entertainment of the party accompanying a prospective student-athlete to the campus shall be limited to two relatives his parents (or legal guardians), and a given prospect's relatives parents (or legal guardians) may be entertained for one and only one visit. Such visit shall not exceed forty-eight hours."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To conform this paragraph to the provisions of B1-5-(e).

Action: Approved by hand vote.

ENTERTAINMENT

No. 59. Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 5, page 36, by adding a new paragraph (i), as follows:

"(i) A member institution may entertain high school, preparatory or junior college coaches only on its campus. Such entertainment may include providing complimentary tickets to home athletic contests."

Source: Big Eight Conference.

Intent: To permit entertainment of high school coaches on the campus of a member institution.

Action: Approved as amended (see No. 120) by hand vote.

PRE-COLLEGE EXPENSE

No. 60. Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 6, page 37, by adding a new paragraph (c), as follows:

"(c) The Council may, by a two-thirds vote of its members, approve exceptions to Bylaw 1-6-(a) provided such exceptions are limited to procedures involving preparation for the initial entrance of prospective students and student-athletes immediately prior to the fall semester or quarter of matriculation. In no case shall the educational grant-in-aid exceed that made available to the regular student body in general and/or as defined in Constitution 3-1-(f)."

Source: Iowa State University.

Intent: To permit the Council to make exceptions to allow institutions to pay pre-enrollment expense of student-athletes under the prescribed conditions.

Action: Not considered by the Convention.

FOOTBALL BOWL OFFICIALS

No. 61. Bylaws: Amend Article 2, Section 2-(d), page 39, as follows:

"(d) Game officials shall be mutually agreed upon by the competing institutions assigned by selected allied conferences according to a formula approved by the Extra Events Committee. The formula shall provide that the officials assigned to each game shall be assigned by a conference which does not have a member institution (or a non-member institution for which it assigns officials during the regular season) competing in the game. The selected conferences shall be those which operate established officials' training and assignment programs and which traditionally have member teams competing in certified postseason football games."

Source: NCAA Council (Extra Events Committee).

Intent: To provide neutral officiating crews for certified postseason football games according to a formula recommended by the Collegiate Commissioners Association and approved by the Extra Events Committee.

Action: Withdrawn.

BASKETBALL PLAYING SEASON

No. 62. Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(b), page 43, as follows:

"(b) Preseason practice in basketball shall not begin prior to October 15 of each year. The first contest (game or scrimmage) with outside competition shall not be played prior to the last Friday in November [except as provided in paragraph (d) below]. The last contest (game or scrimmage) shall not be played after the National Collegiate Basketball Championship game. Informal practice scrimmages with outside competition may be permitted prior to the last Friday in November provided they are conducted in privacy without publicity or official scoring and provided further that such scrimmages shall be counted against the permissible number of contests. The maximum number of contests games or scrimmages with outside competition shall not exceed twenty-six, exclusive of contests in one postseason tournament. An institution which has scheduled twenty-six games may conduct a maximum of two scrimmages with outside competition in addition to its twenty-six games. No postseason tournament game shall be played after the final game of the National Collegiate Basketball Championship."

Source: MacMurray College (National Association of Basketball Coaches).

Intent: To permit a total of 28 contests with outside competition, 26 games and two scrimmages.

Action: Defeated by hand vote.

BASEBALL PLAYING SEASON

No. 63. Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 1, page 44, by adding a new paragraph (c) and re-lettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

"(c) The maximum number of baseball contests (games or scrimmages) with outside competition during the academic year

shall not exceed fifty, exclusive of games in one postseason tournament."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To limit the number of baseball contests member institutions may play during the academic year.

Action: Defeated 84-167.

BASEBALL PLAYING SEASON

No. 64. Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 1, page 44, by adding a new paragraph (c) and relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

"(c) The maximum number of baseball contests (games or scrimmages) with outside competition during the academic year shall not exceed sixty, exclusive of games in one postseason tournament."

Source: Western Athletic Conference.

Intent: To limit the number of baseball contests member institutions may play during the academic year.

Action: Defeated by hand vote.

SPRING FOOTBALL PRACTICE

No. 65. Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 2-(a), page 44, as follows:

"(a) Postseason practice in football shall be limited to *twenty fifteen* sessions in a period of *thirty-six* twenty-one calendar days (vacation and examination days excluded), and activity shall be limited to non-contact conditioning drills. No football gear or protective equipment other than headgear, shoes and porous, lightweight jerseys and pants shall be worn by players during practice sessions in this period."

Source: Atlantic Coast Conference.

Intent: To reduce the length and scope of spring football practice.

Action: Withdrawn.

FOREIGN TOURS

No. 66. Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 3, page 46, as follows:

"Section 3. Exceptions. Any game or games played on a foreign tour, officially approved by the Department of State of the U. S. Government and sanctioned by the Council of the Association, shall be exempted from the limitations set forth in Sections 1 and 2 of this Article. *except that* Any such game or games played during the *permissible playing and practice season must be institution's vacation period, as published in its official catalog, need not* be considered in computing an institution's maximum playing schedule. Request for Council sanction must be made by the institution at least thirty days prior to the competition."

Source: Atlantic Coast Conference.

Intent: To facilitate foreign basketball tours during college vacation periods.

Action: Approved by hand vote.

FOOTBALL CHAMPIONSHIPS

No. 67. Bylaws: Amend Article 2, Section 2, page 39; and Amend Article 3, Section 3, page 46, as follows:

"Article 2, Section 2. No member institution shall compete in any football game that is not scheduled as to the identity of a participating collegiate team before the beginning of the regular football season of the college for any academic year, unless the given contest is a part of the NCAA Championship for Division II members or complies with the following requirements or meets the following conditions:

[Paragraphs (a) through (n) remain unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (College Football Committee).

Intent: To provide exceptions for those institutions competing in an NCAA football tournament for Division II members (or basically the College Division membership in the event the proposed re-naming of Divisions is not approved).

Action: Approved by hand vote.

FOOTBALL CHAMPIONSHIPS

No. 68. Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 6-(a), page 53; and amend Article 5, Section 3, page 58, as follows:

"Bylaw 4, Section 6-(a). A member institution, through process of institutional self-determination, shall designate its athletic program as either University Division or College Division for competition in those sports in which the NCAA sponsors a national championship in each division. In the sport of football, institutions which are not classified as Division I shall be eligible for the Division II Championships."

"Bylaw 5, Section 3. Only active members in good standing which have designated College Division in accordance with the provisions of Bylaw 4-6-(a) shall be eligible for the following meets and tournaments established under the auspices of the Association:

The National College Division Baseball Championship
The National College Division Basketball Championship
The National College Division Cross Country Championships
The National College Division II Football Championship
The National College Division III Football Championship
The National College Division Golf Championships
The National College Division Gymnastics Championships
The National College Division Swimming Championships
The National College Division Tennis Championships
The National College Division Outdoor Track Championships
The National College Division Wrestling Championships"

Source: NCAA Council (College Football Committee).

Intent: To establish two National Football Championship tournaments for Division II members or, if the reorganized and renamed divisions are not approved, then establish two national tournaments for the institutions which are not classified "Major" by the NCAA Football Statistics and Classification Committee.

Action: Approved by hand vote.

FRESHMAN RULE

No. 69. Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 1-(f), page 49, as follows:
"(f) He must not previously have engaged in *three four* seasons of varsity competition after his *freshman year*, it being understood that:

[Paragraphs (1), (2), (3) and (4) remain unchanged.]

Source: California Collegiate Athletic Association.

Intent: To allow each student-athlete four years of eligibility for NCAA Championships beyond the freshman year if he did not engage in intercollegiate competition in the sport during his freshman season.

Action: Defeated by hand vote.

HARDSHIP

No. 70. Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 1-(f)-(1), and add a new O.I. 408, page 49, as follows:

"(f) He must not previously have engaged in three seasons of varsity competition after his freshman year, it being understood that:

"(1) Any participation during a season in an intercollegiate sport, regardless of time, shall be counted as a season of competition in that sport, *except that a student-athlete granted an additional year of competition by his conference or institution for reasons of hardship is eligible for an additional season. Indoor and outdoor track and field shall be considered separate sports.*"

"O.I. 408. 'Hardship' is that incapacitating condition resulting from injury or illness sustained prior to the second game or contest of the season which causes the loss of the remainder of that season's participation."

Source: Mid-American Conference.

Intent: To permit a student-athlete to be awarded one additional year of eligibility for NCAA Championships for reasons of hardship.

Action: Approved as amended (see No. 71) by hand vote.

HARDSHIP

No. 71. Bylaws: Add a new O.I. 408, following B4-1-(f), page 49, as follows:

"O.I. 408. 'Hardship' is that incapacitating condition resulting from injury or illness which prevents a student-athlete from participating in more than one football game, or in more than three contests in other sports, provided the injury or illness occurred during the first half of the institution's regular schedule in the sport involved. This provision shall be administered by the allied conferences of the Association, or in the case of an independent member institution, by the NCAA Eligibility Committee."

Source: Big Eight Conference.

Intent: To define hardship and to provide machinery for processing of appeals.

Action: Approved by hand vote.

ALIEN STUDENT-ATHLETES

No. 72. Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 1-(f)-(2), page 49, as follows:

"(f) He must not have engaged in three seasons of varsity competition after his freshman year, it being understood that:

"(2) Participation as an individual or as a representative of any team whatever in a foreign country by an alien student-athlete in each twelve-month period after his nineteenth birthday and prior to his matriculation at a member institution shall count as one year of varsity competition, *except that he may participate throughout the season in sports which are in progress or begin during the school year in which he reaches his nineteenth birthday.*"

Source: Colorado College; University of Denver; University of Michigan; Michigan Technological University; University of North Dakota; University of Notre Dame; University of Minnesota, Duluth.

Intent: To enable alien student-athletes to complete the sports season in progress at the time they reach their nineteenth birthday without such participation counting as a varsity season.

Action: Defeated by hand vote.

TRANSFER RULE

No. 73. Bylaws: Amend O.I. 400-(b), following B4-1-(h), page 50, as follows:

"O.I. 400. (b) He shall not be considered a transfer:

"(7) Upon return from at least eighteen months of active service in the Armed Forces of the United States or from at least eighteen months of active service on an official church mission."

Source: Big Sky Athletic Conference.

Intent: To permit students returning from eighteen months on an official church mission to be immediately eligible upon transfer to another institution.

Action: Approved by hand vote.

ELIGIBILITY FOR NCAA CHAMPIONSHIPS

No. 74. Bylaws: Amend O.I. 407, following Bylaw 4-1, page 52, as follows:

"A student whose eligibility changes at the end of a quarter or semester shall become eligible or ineligible to compete in an NCAA event on the first day of classes of the following semester or quarter, *except that if he is eligible to compete at the time of his or his institution's first participation in an NCAA event, he shall remain eligible for the remainder of that event.*"

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To confirm that a student who is eligible at the beginning of an NCAA event remains eligible throughout that event.

Action: Approved by hand vote.

1.600 RULE

No. 75. Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 6, by deleting paragraphs (b), (c), (d) and all applicable interpretations, pages 53-57.

Source: Queens College.

Intent: To abolish the 1.600 legislation.

Action: Approved 204-187 (effectively immediately).

1.600 RULE

No. 76. Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 6-(b), page 53, as follows:

"(b) A member institution shall not be eligible to enter a team or individual competitors in an NCAA-sponsored meet, unless the institution in the conduct of all its intercollegiate athletic programs:

"(1) Limits its scholarship or grant-in-aid awards (for which the recipient's athletic ability is considered in any degree), and eligibility for participation in athletics or in organized athletic practice sessions during the first year in residence, to student-athletes who have a predicted minimum grade point average of at least 1.600 (based on a maximum of 4.000) as determined by the Association's national prediction tables or Association-approved conference or institutional tables, who have graduated from high school with a minimum grade point average of 2.000 (based on a maximum of 4.000) for all work taken and certified officially on the high school transcript, except that an institution may provide financial aid to a student whose matriculation was not solicited by a member of the athletic department or by a representative of its athletic interests (see O.I. 100) and whose admission and financial aid have been granted without regard in any degree to his athletic ability; such a student shall not be eligible for participation in athletics or in organized athletic practice sessions unless he satisfies the requirements of paragraph (2) and there is on file in the office of the director of athletics certification by the faculty athletic representative, the admissions officer and chairman of the financial aid committee that this exception applies; and

"(2) Limits its subsequent scholarship and grant-in-aid awards (for which the recipient's athletic ability is considered in any degree) and eligibility for competition in varsity intercollegiate athletics to student-athletes who have a grade point average either accumulative or for the previous academic year of at least 1.600; for the previous academic year of 1.700 at the completion of the first academic year, 1.800 at the completion of the second academic year, 1.900 at the completion of the third academic year and 2.000 at the completion of the fourth academic year; except that the performance requirement of this paragraph shall not apply to a student-athlete who predicted at least 1.600 upon entrance into an institution which used the Association's national prediction tables or more demanding institutional or conference predictive formulae in applying paragraph (1). As to such a student-athlete, he shall be limited only by the official institutional regulations governing normal progress to a degree for all students, as well as any other applicable

institutional eligibility rules, including those of the athletic conference of which the institution is a member. These institutional or conference standards shall be filed in the office of the Association.

"(3) Limits its initial scholarship and grant-in-aid awards (for which the recipient's athletic ability is considered in any degree) and eligibility for participation in athletics or organized practice sessions during the first year of residence of student-athletes transferring from another collegiate institution to those who meet the requirements outlined in paragraph (2) above, except that a student-athlete who transfers from a junior college and who failed to predict 1.600 on the Association's national experience tables must graduate from high school with the minimum 2.000 grade point average must: (i) be a graduate of the junior college; or (ii) present a minimum of forty-eight semester hours or a minimum of seventy-two quarter hours of transferable degree credit with an accumulative minimum grade point average of 1.600 1.800 and have spent a minimum of two academic years in residence at the junior college, excluding summer sessions."

Source: Pacific-8 Conference.

Intent: To eliminate the prediction requirements of the 1.600 rule, substituting a high school GPA requirement for the incoming student and a college GPA for the continuing student-athlete.

Action: Consideration of (1), (2) and (3) separately: (1) approved by hand vote (effective immediately); (2) defeated by hand vote; (3) defeated 145-169.

1.600 RULE

No. 77. Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 6-(b), pages 53 and 54, as follows:

(b) A member institution shall not be eligible to enter a team or individual competitors in an NCAA-sponsored meet unless the institution in the conduct of all of its intercollegiate programs:

(1) Limits its scholarship or grant-in-aid awards (for which the recipient's athletic ability is considered in any degree) and eligibility for participation in athletics or any organized athletic practice sessions during the first year in residence to student-athletes who have a predicted minimum grade point average of at least 1.600 (based on a maximum of 4.000) as determined by the Association's national prediction tables or Association-approved conference or institutional tables, present a minimum grade point average of 2.000 at the time of their graduation from high school, except that an institution may provide financial aid to a student whose matriculation was not solicited by a member of the athletic department or by a representative of its athletic interests (O.I. 100) and whose admission and financial aid have been granted without regard in any degree to his athletic ability; such a student shall not be eligible for participation in athletics or in organized athletic practice sessions unless he satisfies the requirements of paragraph (2) and there is on file in the office of the director of athletics certification by the faculty

athletic representative, the admissions officer and chairman of the financial aid committee that this exception applies; and.

(2) Limits its Subsequent scholarship and grant-in-aid awards (for which the recipient's athletic ability is considered in any degree) and eligibility for competition in varsity intercollegiate athletics to student-athletes who have a grade point average, either accumulative or for the previous academic year, of at least 1.600; except that the performance requirement of this paragraph shall not apply to a student-athlete who predicted at least 1.600 upon entrance into an institution which uses the Association's national prediction tables or more demanding institutional or conference predictive formulae in applying paragraph (1). As to such a student-athlete, he shall be limited only by the official institutional regulations governing normal progress toward a degree for all students, as well as any other applicable institutional eligibility rules, including those of the athletic conference of which the institution is a member. These institutional or conference standards shall be filed in the office of the Association.

(3) Limits its initial scholarship and grant-in-aid awards (for which the recipient's athletic ability is considered in any degree) and eligibility for participation in athletics or organized practice sessions during the first year of residence of student-athletes transferring from another collegiate institution to those who meet the requirements outlined in paragraphs (1) and (2) above, except that a student-athlete who transfers from a junior college and who failed to predict 1.600 on the Association's national prediction tables must present an accumulative minimum grade point average of 2.000 upon his graduation from high school must: (i) be a graduate of the junior college; or (ii) present a minimum of forty-eight semester hours or a minimum of seventy-two quarter hours of transferable degree credit with an accumulative minimum grade point average of 1.600 2.000 and have spent at least two academic years (four semesters or six quarters) in residence at the junior college, excluding summer sessions, or (iii) present a minimum of thirty-six semester hours or a minimum of forty-eight quarter hours of transferable degree credit with an accumulative minimum grade point average of 2.250 and have spent at least three semesters or four quarters in residence at the junior college, excluding summer sessions, or (iv) present a minimum of twenty-four semester hours or a minimum of thirty-six quarter hours of transferable degree credit with an accumulative minimum grade point average of 2.500 and have spent at least two semesters or three quarters in residence at the junior college, excluding summer sessions."

[Note: Delete all interpretations related to the 1.600 legislation.]

Source: Pacific Coast Athletic Association.

Intent: To eliminate the 1.600 prediction requirement and establish a 2.000 high school grade point average as the necessary minimum to qualify.

Action: Consideration of (1), (2) and (3) separately: (1) withdrawn; (2) approved by hand vote (effective immediately); (3) approved by hand vote (effective immediately).

1.600 RULE

No. 78. Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 6-(b), page 53, as follows:

(b) A member institution shall not be eligible to enter a team or individual competitors in an NCAA-sponsored meet, unless the institution in the conduct of all its intercollegiate athletic programs establishes academic prediction and performance requirements whereby it:

[Note: Paragraph (1) remains unchanged.]

"(2) Limits its subsequent scholarship and grant-in-aid awards (for which the recipient's athletic ability is considered in any degree) and eligibility for competition in varsity intercollegiate athletics to student-athletes who have a grade point average, either accumulative or for the previous academic year, of at least 1.600; except that the performance requirement of this paragraph shall not apply to a student-athlete who predicted at least 1.600 upon entrance into an institution which uses the Association's national prediction tables or more demanding institutional or conference predictive formulae in applying paragraph (1). As to such a student-athlete, he shall be limited only by the official institutional regulations governing normal progress toward a degree for all students, as well as any other applicable institutional eligibility rules, including those of the athletic conference of which the institution is a member. These institutional or conference standards shall be filed in the office of the Association; or

(3) For any student-athletes who do not meet the requirements of paragraphs (1) and (2), limits its scholarship or grant-in-aid awards (for which the recipient's athletic ability is considered in any degree), and eligibility for participation in athletics or in organized athletic practice sessions during the first year in residence to student-athletes who have an accumulative high school grade point average at graduation of not less than 2.350 or a rank-in-class at high school graduation in the fiftieth percentile or higher; and limits its subsequent scholarship and grant-in-aid awards (for which the recipient's athletic ability is considered in any degree) and eligibility for competition in varsity intercollegiate athletics to student-athletes meeting the following performance requirements:

(i) For the academic year beginning the autumn term following his entrance into the member institution the student-athlete must have an accumulative grade point average of at least 1.600 on at least eighty per cent of the degree credits of the normal full-time yearly load (or of that part of the regular academic year of his attendance in the member institution if he has not previously been in attendance a full academic year), and

(ii) For each succeeding year he must have at least an additional eighty per cent of the degree credits of the normal full-time yearly load, with an accumulative grade point average

at or above an increasing minimum which at the beginning of any fifth year in a collegiate institution is at least equal to the minimum graduation requirement.

[Note: Paragraph (3) shall be renumbered.]

"O.I. 420. A normal load may be reduced to eighty per cent without violating the academic performance requirement, but participation in athletics should not cause more delay in graduation of the student-athlete as compared with other students in any particular program. If the normal yearly load is thirty semester hours, twenty-four would meet the bylaw requirement; if the normal yearly load is thirty-six, twenty-nine would meet the requirement. The progress is to be measured at the beginning of the autumn term; thus, credits earned in the summer can be considered.

"O.I. 421. The increasing minimum grade point average under Bylaw 4-6-(b)-(3) with a 2.000 graduation requirement would be: beginning of second year, 1.600; third year, 1.733; fourth year, 1.867; fifth year, 2.000."

Source: University of Washington.

Intent: To establish a standard grade point average and rank-in-class for incoming freshmen; to define and require normal progress toward a degree, and to increase the required grade point average for succeeding years.

Action: Withdrawn.

1.600 RULE

No. 79. Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 6-(b), page 53, as follows:

"(b) A member institution shall not be eligible to enter a team or individual competitors in an NCAA-sponsored meet or tournament unless the institution in the conduct of all its intercollegiate athletic programs:

"(1) Limits its scholarship or grant-in-aid awards (for which the recipient's athletic ability is considered in any degree), and eligibility for participation in athletics, or in organized athletic practice sessions, during the first year in residence to student-athletes who have a predicted minimum grade point average of at least 1.600 (based on a maximum of 4.000) as determined by the Association's national prediction tables or Association-approved conference or institutional tables; except that an institution may provide financial aid to a student whose matriculation was not solicited by a member of the athletic department or by a representative of its athletic interests (see O.I. 100) and whose admission and financial aid have been granted without regard in any degree to his athletic ability; such a student shall not be eligible for participation in athletics or in organized athletic practice sessions unless he satisfies the requirements of paragraph (2) and there is on file in the office of the director of athletics certification by the faculty athletic representative, the admissions officer and chairman of the financial aid committee that this exception applies; and

"(2) Limits its subsequent scholarship and grant-in-aid awards (for which the recipient's athletic ability is considered

in any degree) and eligibility for competition in varsity intercollegiate athletics to student-athletes who have a grade point average, either accumulative or for the previous academic year, of at least 1.600. except that The performance requirement of this paragraph shall not apply to a student-athlete who predicted at least 1.600 upon entrance into an institution which uses the Association's national prediction tables or more demanding institutional or conference predictive formulae in applying paragraph (1). As to such a student-athlete, he shall be limited only by the official institutional regulations governing normal progress toward a degree for all students, as well as any other applicable institutional eligibility rules, including those of the athletic conference of which the institution is a member. These institutional or conference standards shall be filed in the office of the Association.

"(3) Limits its initial scholarship and grant-in-aid awards (for which the recipient's athletic ability is considered in any degree) and eligibility for participation in athletics or in organized practice sessions during the first year in residence of student-athletes transferring from another collegiate institution to those who meet the requirements outlined in paragraph (2) above, except that a student-athlete who transfers from a junior college and who failed to predict 1.600 on the Association's national experience must: (i) be a graduate of the junior college; or (ii) present a minimum of forty-eight semester hours or a minimum of seventy-two quarter hours of transferable degree credit with an accumulative minimum grade point average of 1.600 and have spent a minimum of two academic years in residence at the junior college, excluding summer sessions."

[Note: Adoption of this amendment will require editorial changes in the following Official Interpretations: O.I. 414; O.I. 417, and O.I. 418.]

Source: NCAA Council (Committee on Academic Testing and Requirements).

Intent: To remove the financial aid restrictions from the 1.600 rule.

Action: Withdrawn.

1.600 RULE

No. 80. Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 6-(b), page 53, as follows:

"(b) A member institution which recruits, prefers by admission of financial assistance or otherwise, directly or indirectly student-athletes shall not be eligible to enter a team or individual competitors in an NCAA-sponsored meet or tournament, unless the institution in the conduct of all its intercollegiate athletic programs:"

Source: Hunter College.

Intent: To exempt from the 1.600 rule institutions which do not recruit student-athletes.

Action: Defeated by hand vote.

1.600 RULE

No. 81. Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 6-(b)-(1), page 53, as follows:

"(1) Limits its scholarship or grant-in-aid awards (for which the recipient's athletic ability is considered in any degree), and eligibility for participation in athletics or in organized athletic practice sessions during the first year in residence to student-athletes who have a predicted minimum grade point average of at least 1.600 (based on a maximum of 4.000) as determined by the Association's national prediction tables or Association-approved conference or institutional tables, except that an institution may provide financial aid to a student whose matriculation was not solicited by a member of the athletic department or by a representative of its athletic interests (see O.I. 100) and whose admission and financial aid have been granted without regard in any degree to his athletic ability; such a student shall not be eligible for participation in athletics or in organized athletic practice sessions unless he satisfies the requirements of paragraph (2) and there is on file in the office of the director of athletics certification by the faculty athletic representative, the admissions officer and chairman of the financial aid committee that this exception applies; the preceding paragraph shall only apply to persons recruited or preferred in any way because of athletic ability; and"

Source: Hunter College.

Intent: To exempt from the 1.600 rule student-athletes who were not recruited for athletic reasons.

Action: Not considered by the Convention.

1.600 RULE

No. 82. Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 6-(b)-(1), page 53, as follows:

"(1) Limits its scholarship or grant-in-aid awards (for which the recipient's athletic ability is considered in any degree), and eligibility for participation in athletics or in organized athletic practice sessions during the first year in residence to student-athletes who have a predicted minimum grade point average of at least 1.600 (based on a maximum of 4.000) as determined by the Association's national prediction tables or Association-approved conference or institutional tables, except that an institution may provide financial aid to a student whose matriculation was not solicited by a member of the athletic department or by a representative of its athletic interests (see O.I. 100) and whose admission and financial aid have been granted without regard in any degree to his athletic ability; such a student shall not be eligible for participation in athletics or in organized athletic practice sessions unless he satisfies the requirements of paragraph (2) and there is on file in the office of the director of athletics certification by the faculty athletic representative, the admissions officer and chairman of the financial aid committee that this exception applies; the preceding paragraph shall not apply to any institution which (i) neither requires the SAT or the ACT for admission to such institution and (ii) gives no preference by way of admission or financial assistance to any student because of athletic ability and (iii) requires at least a 1.600 academic index for all students after the first year to be eligible for participation in athletic programs; and"

Source: Hunter College.

Intent: To exempt from the 1.600 rule institutions which do not require admission tests, give no preference to athletes in admissions and require a minimum 1.600 average after the first year in residence.

Action: Not considered by the Convention.

1.600 RULE

No. 83. Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 6-(b)-(1), page 53, as follows:

"(1) Limits its scholarship or grant-in-aid awards (for which the recipient's athletic ability is considered in any degree), and eligibility for participation in athletics or in organized athletic practice sessions during the first year in residence to student-athletes who have a predicted minimum grade point average of at least 1.600 (based on a maximum of 4.000) as determined by the Association's national prediction tables or Association-approved conference or institutional tables, except that an institution may provide financial aid to a student whose matriculation was not solicited by a member of the athletic department or by a representative of its athletic interests (see O.I. 100) and whose admission and financial aid have been granted without regard in any degree to his athletic ability; such a student shall not be eligible for participation in athletics or in organized athletic practice sessions unless he satisfies the requirements of paragraph (2) and there is on file in the office of the director of athletics certification by the faculty athletic representative, the admissions officer and chairman of the financial aid committee that this exception applies, except the preceding paragraph shall not apply to any institution which in no way prefers by admission, financial assistance or otherwise, directly or indirectly, any applicant or student because of athletic ability;"

Source: Hunter College.

Intent: To exempt from the 1.600 rule institutions which do not recruit student-athletes.

Action: Not considered by the Convention.

1.600 RULE

No. 84. Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Sections 6-(b) and 6-(c), pages 53-54, as follows:

"(b) A member institution shall not be eligible to enter a team or individual competitors in an NCAA-sponsored meet or tournament unless the institution in the conduct of all its intercollegiate athletic programs applies the procedures outlined in paragraphs (1), (2) and (3) below as regards those student-athletes whose matriculation was solicited by a member of the institution's athletic department or by a representative of its athletic interests (per O.I. 100). For such student-athletes the institution must certify that it:

[Note: Paragraphs (1), (2) and (3) remain unchanged.]

"(4) Student-athletes whose matriculation was not solicited

by a member of the institution's athletic department or by a representative of its athletic interests (per O.I. 100) shall be limited only by the official institutional regulations governing normal progress toward a degree for all students, as well as any other applicable institutional eligibility rules, including those of the athletic conference of which the institution is a member. These institutional or conference standards shall be filed in the office of the Association.

"(c) Institutions which conform to the requirements of paragraph (b) shall maintain a file available for examination upon request which contains certification that:

"(i) Each eligible student-athlete whose matriculation was solicited by a member of the institution's athletic department or a representative of its athletic interests (per O.I. 100) meets the minimum requirements of paragraph (b).

"(ii) Each eligible student-athlete who does not meet the minimum requirements of paragraph (b) is not one whose matriculation was solicited by a member of the institution's athletic department or a representative of its athletic interests (per O.I. 100)."

Source: Rice University.

Intent: To exempt from the 1.600 rule athletes who were not recruited for athletic reasons.

Action: Withdrawn.

1.600 RULE

No. 85. Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 6-(d), page 55, as follows:

"(d) Institutions which do not conform to the requirements of Bylaw 4-6-(b) shall be ineligible for NCAA-sponsored events and appearances on the NCAA national football television program until they have operated in conformity for a period of two years. Institutions in compliance with paragraph (b)-(1) through use of the NCAA national tables or more demanding predictive processes may qualify for the exception in paragraph (b)-(2) immediately. In other cases, paragraph (b)-(2) shall continue to apply to student-athletes recruited prior to compliance with the stipulations of paragraph (b)-(1).

Source: Pacific Coast Athletic Association.

Intent: To conform this paragraph to proposed legislation in Proposal No. 77.

Action: Approved by hand vote (effective immediately).

TRANSFER RULE

No. 86. Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 1-(d), page 48, as follows:

"(d) He must, after transfer from another collegiate institution, have completed one full year of two full semesters or three full quarters and one calendar year must have elapsed from his first registration at the certifying institution, except that this provision shall not apply if he predicted a minimum grade point average of 1.600 or better on the NCAA national prediction tables at the time of his graduation from high school he presented an accumu-

lative minimum grade point average of 2.000, and meets one or more of the following requirements: (i) he is a graduate of a junior college; or (ii) he presents a minimum of forty-eight semester hours or a minimum of seventy-two quarter hours of transferable degree credit from a junior college with an accumulative minimum grade point average of 1.600; or (iii) he presents a minimum of twenty-four semester hours or a minimum of thirty-six quarter hours of transferable degree credit from a junior college with an accumulative minimum grade point average of 2.500 2.000, and he has spent at least two semesters or three quarters in residence at the junior college, excluding summer sessions."

Source: Pacific Coast Athletic Association.

Intent: To eliminate the requirements of the 1.600 legislation from the transfer rule.

Action: Approved by hand vote (effective immediately).

TRANSFER RULE

No. 87. Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 1-(d), page 48, as follows:

"(d) He must, after transfer from another collegiate institution, have completed one full year of two full semesters or three full quarters and one calendar year must have elapsed from his first registration at the certifying institution, except that this provision shall not apply if he predicted a minimum grade point average of 1.600 or better on the NCAA national prediction tables at the time of his graduation from high school graduated from high school with a minimum grade point average of 2.000 and meets one or more of the following requirements: (i) he is a graduate of a junior college; or (ii) he presents a minimum of forty-eight semester hours or a minimum of seventy-two quarter hours of transferable degree credit from a junior college with an accumulative minimum grade point average of 1.600 1.800, or (iii) he presents a minimum of twenty-four semester hours, or a minimum of thirty-six quarter hours of transferable degree credit from a junior college with an accumulative minimum grade point average of 2.500."

Source: Pacific-8 Conference.

Intent: To substitute a minimum high school GPA for the minimum 1.600 prediction in the transfer rule for NCAA Championships.

Action: Withdrawn.

TRANSFER RULE

No. 88. Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 1-(d), page 48, as follows:

"(d) He must, after transfer from another collegiate institution, have completed one full year of two full semesters or three full quarters and one calendar year must have elapsed from his first registration at the certifying institution, except that this provision shall not apply if he predicted a minimum grade point average of 1.600 or better on the NCAA national prediction tables at the time of his graduation from high school and meets one or more of the following requirements: (i) he is a graduate of a junior college; or (ii) he presents a minimum of forty-eight semester hours or a min-

imum of seventy-two quarter hours of transferable degree credit from a junior college with an accumulative minimum grade point average of 1.600; or (iii) he presents a minimum of thirty-six semester hours or a minimum of forty-eight quarter hours of transferable degree credit from a junior college with an accumulative minimum grade point average of 2.000 and receives a written release from the junior college attended; or (iv) he presents a minimum of twenty-four semester hours or a minimum of thirty-six quarter hours of transferable degree credit from a junior college with an accumulative minimum grade point average of 2.500."

Source: Missouri Valley Conference.

Intent: To modify the junior college transfer rule for 1.600 predictors provided a written release is obtained from the junior college.

Action: Withdrawn.

TRANSFER RULE

No. 89. Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 1-(d)-(2), page 48, as follows:

"(2) A student who transfers from a collegiate institution while he is disqualified or suspended for disciplinary reasons must complete two one calendar years of residence at the certifying institution."

Source: University of Scranton.

Intent: To remove the additional year's residence requirement for students who have been disqualified or suspended from another college for disciplinary reasons.

Action: Approved 153-123.

TRANSFER RULE

No. 90. Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 1-(e), page 48, as follows:

"(e) After transfer from another collegiate institution, a student-athlete who did not predict a minimum grade point average of 1.600 or better on the NCAA national prediction tables present a minimum grade point average of 2.000 at the time of his graduation from high school must have completed one full year of two full semesters or three full quarters, and one calendar year must have elapsed from his first registration at the certifying institution, except that this provision shall not apply if: (i) he is a graduate of a junior college; or (ii) he presents a minimum of forty-eight semester hours or a minimum of seventy-two quarter hours of transferable degree credit with an accumulative minimum grade point average of 1.600 2.000 and has spent at least two academic years (four semesters or six quarters) in residence at the junior college, excluding summer sessions; or (iii) he presents a minimum of thirty-six semester hours or a minimum of forty-eight quarter hours of transferable degree credit with an accumulative minimum grade point average of 2.250 and has spent at least three semesters or four quarters in residence at the junior college, excluding summer sessions, or (iv) he presents a minimum of twenty-four semester hours or a minimum of thirty-six quarters of transferable degree credit with an accumulative mini-

imum grade point average of 2.500 and has spent at least two semesters or three quarters in residence at the junior college, excluding summer sessions."

Source: Pacific Coast Athletic Association.

Intent: To remove the requirements of the 1.600 legislation from the transfer rule for NCAA events.

Action: Approved by hand vote.

TRANSFER RULE

No. 91. Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 1-(e), page 48, as follows:

"(e) After transfer from another collegiate institution, a student-athlete who did not predict a minimum grade point average of 1.600 or better on the NCAA national prediction tables at the time of his graduation from high school graduate from high school with a minimum grade point average of 2.000 must have completed one full year of two full semesters or three full quarters and one calendar year must have elapsed from his first registration at the certifying institution, except that this provision shall not apply if: (i) he is a graduate of a junior college; or (ii) he presents a minimum of forty-eight semester hours or a minimum of seventy-two quarter hours of transferable degree credit with an accumulative minimum grade point average of 1.600 1.800 and has spent at least two academic years in residence at a junior college, excluding summer sessions."

Source: Pacific-8 Conference.

Intent: To substitute a minimum high school GPA for the sub-1.600 predictor in the transfer rule for NCAA Championships.

Action: Withdrawn.

TRANSFER RULE

No. 92. Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 1-(e), page 48, as follows:

"(e) After transfer from another collegiate institution, a student-athlete who did not predict a minimum grade point average of 1.600 or better on the NCAA national prediction tables at the time of his graduation from high school must have completed one full year of two full semesters or three full quarters and one calendar year must have elapsed from his first registration at the certifying institution, except that this provision shall not apply if: (i) he is a graduate of a junior college; or (ii) he presents a minimum of forty-five semester hours or a minimum of sixty quarter hours of transferable degree credit with an accumulative minimum grade point average of 2.000 and has spent at least three semesters or four quarters, excluding summer sessions, in residence at a junior college and receives a written release from the junior college attended; or (iii) he presents a minimum of forty-eight semester hours or a minimum of seventy-two quarter hours of transferable degree credit with an accumulative minimum grade point average of 1.600 and has spent at least two academic years in residence at a junior college, excluding summer sessions."

Source: Missouri Valley Conference.

Intent: To permit non-predictors, under the prescribed conditions, to become immediately eligible after three semesters or four quarters at a junior college.

Action: Withdrawn.

DRUGS

No. 93. Bylaws: Amend Article 4, by adding a new Section 2, page 52, as follows:

"Section 2. **Drugs.** Student-athletes competing in NCAA Championships shall not use any unauthorized drugs which may endanger their health or safety or which may seemingly give an unfair competitive advantage to an individual competitor. This does not preclude the use of drugs prescribed by a physician in the course of medical treatment.

"(a) The Council shall, from time to time after enlisting expert advice and study, enumerate the drugs which may not be used.

"(b) The Executive Committee may authorize urinalysis or other methods for testing student-athletes who compete in NCAA Championships to determine the extent of drug usage therein."

Source: NCAA Council (Drug Education Committee).

Intent: To preclude the use of unauthorized drugs by student-athletes competing in NCAA Championships, and to initiate testing procedures at NCAA Championships.

Action: Approved by hand vote (effective immediately).

INELIGIBLE PARTICIPATION

No. 94. Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 5, page 53, as follows:

"Ineligible Participation. Anyone who participates ineligibly in an NCAA Championship forfeits his eligibility for one season for all NCAA Championships, such season to be the season immediately following disclosure of his ineligible participation."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To confirm existing policy specifying the season to be forfeited; effective immediately.

Action: Approved by hand vote.

COLLEGE DIVISION REGIONAL CHAMPIONSHIPS

No. 95. Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Sections 3-(b) and 4-(a), page 59, as follows:

"(b) In addition, regional College Division competition may be conducted in the above sports and in the sport of football subject to the approval of the Executive Committee. Such regional events shall meet the requirements established by the Executive Committee.

"Section 4. (a) Meets and tournaments of the Association shall be under the control, direction and supervision of the meet or tournament committees of the particular sports subject to the requirements, standards and conditions prescribed by the Executive Regulations. If such a committee is not established for a given meet or tournament, the event shall be administered by the rules

committee of that sport. In those instances of College Division competition on a regional basis, the College Committee shall have the responsibility of administering such events unless a specific committee is established to administer a regional sports program."

Source: NCAA Council (NCAA Executive Committee).

Intent: To eliminate regional College Division competition; effective immediately.

Action: Approved by hand vote.

COLLEGE DIVISION SOCCER CHAMPIONSHIP

No. 96. Bylaws: Amend Article 5, page 59, as follows:

"Section 3. Only active members in good standing which have designated College Division in accordance with the provisions of Bylaw 4-6-(a) shall be eligible for the following meets and tournaments established under the auspices of the Association:

The National College Division Baseball Championship
The National College Division Basketball Championship
The National College Division Cross Country Championships
The National College Division Golf Championships
The National College Division Gymnastics Championships
The National College Division Soccer Championship
The National College Division Swimming Championships
The National College Division Tennis Championships
The National College Division Outdoor Track Championships
The National College Division Wrestling Championships"

Source: NCAA Executive Committee.

Intent: To establish the Championship indicated; effective immediately.

Action: Approved by hand vote.

COLLEGE DIVISION LACROSSE CHAMPIONSHIP

No. 97. Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 3, page 58, as follows:

"Section 3. Only active members in good standing which have designated College Division in accordance with the provisions of Bylaw 4-6-(a) shall be eligible for the following meets and tournaments established under the auspices of the Association:

The National College Division Baseball Championship
The National College Division Basketball Championship
The National College Division Cross Country Championships
The National College Division Golf Championships
The National College Division Gymnastics Championships
The National College Division Lacrosse Championship
The National College Division Swimming Championships
The National College Division Tennis Championships
The National College Division Outdoor Track Championships
The National College Division Wrestling Championships"

Source: Fairleigh Dickinson University, Madison.

Intent: To establish the Championship indicated; effective immediately.

Action: Approved as amended (see No. 121) by hand vote.

WAIVER OF BYLAW PROVISIONS

No. 98. Bylaws: Add a new Article 9, page 74, as follows:

"The Council is authorized to exempt any institution, or group or conference of institutions, from the application of any provision of Articles 1 through 4 of these Bylaws if the institution or group which seeks such exemption demonstrates that all its financial aid to all undergraduates is on the basis of need. Such Council action shall require the affirmative vote of two-thirds of its members present and voting. Any such exemption shall be for one year only unless it shall be ratified or renewed by a majority of those present and voting at the annual Convention following the granting of such exemption."

Source: Brown University.

Intent: To permit the Council to waive Bylaws 1 through 4 for institutions which award aid only on the basis of need, subject to subsequent approval of the annual Convention.

Action: Defeated by hand vote.

ENFORCEMENT PROCEDURE

No. 99. Constitution: Amend Article 4, Section 6-(c), page 19, as follows:

"(c) Disciplinary or corrective actions other than suspension or termination of membership may be effected during the period between annual Conventions by a two thirds vote of the members of the Council Committee on Infractions present and voting at any duly called meeting thereof, provided the call of such meeting shall have contained notice of the situation presenting the disciplinary problem. The actions of the Committee on Infractions, however, shall be subject to review by the Council upon appeal. If an active member's accreditation is removed by its regional accrediting agency, said active member shall be reclassified immediately as an associate member."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To make the Committee on Infractions the adjudicatory body and the Council the appeal body in the Association's enforcement procedure.

Action: Approved by hand vote (effectively immediately).

DISCIPLINE OF MEMBERS

No. 100. Bylaws: Amend Article 6, Section 5, page 62, as follows:

"Section 5. Discipline of Members. (a) The Council shall receive and consider complaints filed with the Association charging any member institution with the failure to maintain the academic or athletic standards required for membership, or the failure to meet the conditions and obligations of membership in the Association, may be filed either with the Committee on Infractions or the executive director, or both of them. The Council Each of them shall have authority, either upon the filing of such a complaint or upon its or his own initiative, to institute an in-

quiry or investigation regarding the charges in the complaint.

"(b) The Council shall formulate and publish the procedure governing the administration of the enforcement program as well as the performance of its duties under this Section, and distribute it to the membership of the Association.

"(c) A member under investigation:

"(1) Shall be given notice of any specific charges against it, and the facts upon which such charges are based; and

"(2) Shall be given an opportunity to appear before the Council Committee on Infractions (or Council upon appeal) to answer such charges by the production of evidence.

"All members of the Association are under an obligation to cooperate with the executive director (and his staff), the Committee on Infractions and the Council, and to answer all relevant inquiries it may submitted to them.

"(d) The Council Committee on Infractions shall determine whether it shall (1) itself impose disciplinary measures authorized by Constitution 4-6, or (2) recommend that such action be taken by the Council or next annual Convention."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To enable the Infractions Committee or the executive director to investigate complaints and to permit the Infractions Committee to impose penalties upon institutions found in violation.

Action: Approved by hand vote (effectively immediately).

INFRACTIONS COMMITTEE

No. 101. Bylaws: Amend Article 7, Section 2-(k), page 67, as follows:

"(k) The Infractions Committee shall be composed of three five members presently or previously on the staff of an active or allied member of the Association elected for one-year terms. Its duties and procedures shall be outlined in the Official Procedure Governing the NCAA Enforcement Program, as approved and adopted by the Council and the annual Convention of the Association."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To expand the membership of the Committee to five.

Action: Approved by hand vote (effective immediately).

ENFORCEMENT

No. 102. Enforcement Procedure: Amend Section 7-(d), page 70, of this Official Notice, as follows:

"(d) If the Committee, after a review of institutional or conference action taken in connection with a rule infraction, concludes that the corrective or punitive action taken by the institution or conference is representative of and consistent with NCAA policies and principles, the Committee may exercise the discretion to take no further action. Further, self-disclosure shall be considered in establishing penalties, and if an institution uncovers a

violation prior to its being reported to the NCAA and/or its conference, such disclosure shall be considered as a mitigating factor in determining the penalty. Also, the Committee may adopt a penalty comparable to the institutional or conference penalty without conducting a hearing with the member; however, the Committee shall notify the member of the NCAA rules and regulations violated and the proposed penalty, and advise the member of the opportunity for a hearing. The member must request such hearing within fifteen days of the receipt of the Committee's notification, if such a hearing is to be held. If a member requests such a hearing, the procedures outlined in Section 4 shall be followed. In the absence of a member's request for a hearing, the Committee shall impose the penalty and, if appropriate, make public announcement of its action. Punitive or corrective action taken by an institution or conference shall not prevent the Committee from taking any punitive action which it deems advisable or warranted in any case. In cases of serious violation, the NCAA should not leave the discipline in such cases exclusively to an institution or conference."

Source: Big Eight Conference.

Intent: To make institutional self-disclosure of violations a mitigating factor in considering penalties for rules infractions.

Action: Approved by hand vote.

Appendix B

67th ANNUAL CONVENTION

REVISIONS OF EXECUTIVE REGULATIONS

[The Association's Executive Committee is empowered by the Constitution to adopt Executive Regulations not inconsistent with the provisions of the Constitution or the Bylaws. Following are the revisions of the Executive Regulations as adopted by the Executive Committee during 1972. Those letters and words which have been deleted appear in *italics* and those letters and words which have been added appear in **bold face**. Page numbers listed refer to corresponding pages in the 1972-73 NCAA Manual.]

VOTING

No. 103. Executive Regulations: Amend Regulation 1, page 75, by adding a new third paragraph, as follows:

"The methods of voting at an NCAA Convention shall be as follows: (1) voice; (2) paddle; (3) roll call, and (4) secret, marked ballot."

Source: NCAA Executive Committee.

Intent: To formalize existing procedures.

TICKET PRICES

No. 104. Executive Regulations: Amend Regulation 2, Section 1, page 76, by adding a new paragraph (g), as follows:

"(g) Admission shall be charged at all NCAA Championships. Ticket prices shall be determined by the respective games committees with the approval of the meet or tournament committee responsible for the Championship. All non-competing students and faculty members shall be charged regular admission prices except that cheerleaders in uniform, not to exceed eight in number, may be admitted without charge."

Source: NCAA Executive Committee.

Intent: To require an admission charge for NCAA Championships, subject to the exception noted.

INDIVIDUAL MISCONDUCT

No. 105. Executive Regulations: Amend Regulation 2, Section 3, page 77, by adding a new paragraph (d) and relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

"(d) A meet or tournament committee, or a games committee appointed by it, may disqualify a student-athlete from further competition in the Championship involved for reasons of gross misconduct. The student-athlete shall receive a hearing upon request to the chairman of the appropriate committee."

Source: NCAA Executive Committee.

Intent: To permit disqualification of student-athletes from further competition in an NCAA Championship for gross misconduct.

CLUB SPORTS

No. 106. Executive Regulations: Amend Regulation 2, Section 4, page 78, by adding a new paragraph (e), as follows:

"(e) To be eligible to enter a student-athlete or a team in an NCAA championship, the institution must first recognize the sport involved as a regular varsity intercollegiate sport. To be recognized as a varsity intercollegiate activity, a sport must be administered by the department of intercollegiate athletics, the eligibility of the student-athletes must be supervised in the same manner as all other varsity intercollegiate sports and participants on the team must receive officially established varsity awards."

Source: NCAA Executive Committee.

Intent: To clarify eligibility for NCAA Championships.

OFFICIAL TRAVELING PARTIES

No. 107. Executive Regulations: Amend Regulation 2, Section 9-(c), page 81, as follows:

"(c) Following are the maximum official traveling parties for which expenses shall be paid or prorated:

"National Collegiate Baseball—*Twenty (*)*. **Twenty-Two.**

"National College Division Baseball—**Eighteen.**

"National Collegiate Basketball—*Eighteen*. **Twenty.**

"National College Division Basketball—**Sixteen.**

"National Collegiate Ice Hockey—**Twenty-Two.**

"National Collegiate Lacrosse—**Thirty.**

"National Collegiate Soccer—**Twenty.**

"**National College Division Soccer—Eighteen.**

"National Collegiate Volleyball—**Twelve.**

"National Collegiate Water Polo—**Eighteen.**

"Regional College Division Football—*Forty-Five*. **Fifty.**

*"*Provided sufficient net receipts are available, and subject to contractual arrangements with the sponsoring agency as approved by the Executive Committee, an additional expense allowance may be paid to the eight teams competing in the final round of the National Collegiate Baseball Championship."*

Source: NCAA Executive Committee.

Intent: To raise the maximum traveling parties for expenses purposes in baseball, basketball and football, and to establish the official party for College Division soccer.

HOST INSTITUTION

No. 108. Executive Regulations: Amend Regulation 2, Section 12, page 83, by adding a new paragraph (e), as follows:

"(e) The Executive Committee may reconsider the designation of a host institution to conduct an NCAA meet or tournament if

that institution's team or individual student-athletes are not eligible to compete in the Championship."

Source: NCAA Executive Committee.

Intent: To provide for relocation of an NCAA Championship if the host institution is ineligible to compete in the Championship.

Appendix C

67th ANNUAL CONVENTION

AMENDMENTS TO AMENDMENTS

NOTE: In the following proposed amendments to amendments, those letters and words which appear in *italics* are to be deleted; and those letters and words which appear in **bold face** are to be added. All page numbers listed refer to preceding pages containing proposals to be considered by the Convention.

SWIMMING COMMITTEE

No. 109. Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 9, page A-3, as follows:

"(f) The Swimming Rules and Meet Committee shall consist of thirteen members, *one of whom shall have expertise in diving,* and shall be constituted as follows:

"(1) One member from each of the eight geographic districts;

"(2) Four members-at-large, one of whom shall be elected from a College Division member located in Districts One through Four, one from a College Division member located in Districts Five through Eight and one shall be elected secretary-rules editor, and

"(3) One who shall represent junior college swimming interests.

"(Note: Effective September 1, 1974, the number of at-large representatives shall be reduced to three and the Committee's membership shall be reduced to twelve.)"

Source: NCAA Council

Action: Approved by voice vote.

MEMBERSHIP CRITERIA

No. 110. Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 19, page A-9, as follows:

"(f) Subsequent to the adoption of these procedures, an active or allied member may request a change of its division. Such request shall be received by the Association's executive director not later than August 1 of the particular year on a form approved by the Council. The Council, subsequent to that August 1 and prior to the following January 1, shall determine, *in accordance with the above criteria, if the member's division should be changed.* whether the member's division should be changed provided the member is in substantial compliance with the above criteria. If the Council acts affirmatively on the request by a two-thirds vote of those present and voting, the change shall be effective immediately if the change is from Division I to Division II or effective the following August 1 if the change is from Division II to Division I."

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Not considered by the Convention.

VOTING AND AMENDMENTS

No. 111. Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 22, page A-11, as follows:

"Section 1. (a) The Association may at any Convention adopt

or amend any Bylaws not inconsistent with the provisions of the Constitution by a majority vote, *respectively, in general session,* of the members of Division I and Division II present and voting, provided that the proposed amendment shall have been submitted in writing to the Secretary of the Association by November 15 preceding the Convention. The Secretary shall mail a copy of the proposed amendment to all members of the Association not later than December 1 before the Convention in accordance with the requirements of this Bylaw."

"(b) Each division of the Association may at any Convention, by a majority vote of the members of such division present and voting, adopt or amend any Bylaw. *provided the new or amended Bylaw is as restrictive or more restrictive than the provisions of the Bylaws in existence at the time of the enactment of this provision (January 1973), subject to the exception in paragraph (c).* Determination of which proposals shall be subject to divided voting as indicated in this paragraph shall rest with the Council of the Association."

Source: Big Ten Conference.

Action: Not considered by the Convention.

VOTING AND AMENDMENTS

No. 112. Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 22, page A-11, as follows:

"Section 1. (a) The Association may at any Convention adopt or amend any Bylaws not inconsistent with the provisions of the Constitution by a majority vote, *respectively, in general session,* of the members of Division I and Division II present and voting, provided that the proposed amendment shall have been submitted in writing to the Secretary of the Association by November 15 preceding the Convention. The Secretary shall mail a copy of the proposed amendment to all members of the Association not later than December 1 before the Convention in accordance with the requirements of this Bylaw."

Source: South Dakota State University; University of California, Riverside.

Action: Not considered by the Convention.

OUTSIDE FINANCIAL AID

No. 113. Constitution: Amend No. 29, page A-15, as follows:

"(a) Any student-athlete who receives financial assistance other than that administered by his institution shall not be eligible for intercollegiate competition, except where:

"(3) Assistance is awarded through an established and continuing program to aid students and the award is made on the basis of the recipient's past performance and overall record as measured by established criteria of which athletic participation shall not be the major criterion; disbursement of the assistance must be by the member institution for the educational expenses of the recipient in attending that institution which the recipient has selected, and the recipient's choice of institutions shall not be restricted by the donor of the assistance. Such an award need not

be counted in the maximum permissible assistance, provided it involves no obligation to compete in intercollegiate athletics at the institution of his choice."

Source: West Coast Athletic Conference.

Action: Defeated by voice vote.

LIMITATIONS ON FINANCIAL AID AWARDS

No. 114. Constitution: Amend Proposal No. 41, page A-20, as follows:

"(e) The Bylaws of the Association may prescribe limitations as to the number of financial aid awards a member institution may provide to student-athletes. In accordance with the membership divisions described in Article 6 of the Bylaws, such legislation may be applicable only to the membership division which adopts it."

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Approved by hand vote.

FINANCIAL AID LIMITATIONS

No. 115. Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 42, page A-21, as follows:

"(4) The following Maximum Award Tables are applicable: To the membership divisions described in Constitution 4-3:

MAXIMUM AWARDS TABLE—DIVISION I

Sport	Maximum Initial Awards Per Year	Maximum Additional Awards in Effect the Same Year
Baseball	6	13
Basketball	6	12
Cross Country/Track	7	16
Fencing	3	5
Football	30	75
Golf	3	5
Gymnastics	4	8
Ice Hockey	7	16
Lacrosse	7	16
Skiing	4	8
Soccer	6	13
Swimming	6	13
Tennis	3	5
Volleyball	3	5
Water Polo	3	5
Wrestling	6	13
Total	104	229

(Note: Maximum Awards Table—Division II is deleted.)

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Approved by hand vote.

FINANCIAL AID LIMITATIONS

No. 116. Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 42, page A-21, as follows:

"(1) In each sport, except football and basketball, there shall be an annual limit on the value of the initial financial aid awards

which may be made to student-athletes. An initial award is an award made to freshmen, transfer students (from two-year or four-year institutions) and upperclassmen receiving financial aid for the first time.

"(2) In each sport, except football and basketball, there shall be an annual limit on the number of additional financial aid awards which may be in effect. In the sports of football and basketball only the maximum total awards in effect the same year shall be considered.

"(3) An award first made to a student-athlete during the season or after the end of his sport's season, except in football and basketball, shall be counted as an initial award for either the current academic year (if the institution's annual limit has not been reached) or the next academic year. In the sports of football and basketball, such awards shall be applied to the total in effect for the next academic year.

"(4) The following Maximum Awards Tables are applicable to the membership divisions described in Constitution 4-3.

MAXIMUM AWARDS TABLE—DIVISION I

Sport	Maximum Initial Awards Per Year	Maximum Additional Awards in Effect the Same Year
Baseball	6	13
Basketball	6 0	13 19
Cross Country/Track	7	16
Fencing	3	5
Football	30 0	75 105
Golf	3	5
Gymnastics	4	8
Ice Hockey	7	16
Lacrosse	7	16
Skiing	4	8
Soccer	6	13
Swimming	6	13
Tennis	3	5
Volleyball	3	5
Water Polo	3	5
Wrestling	6	13
Total	104 68	229 265

Source: Missouri Valley Conference.

Action: Defeated by hand vote.

FINANCIAL AID LIMITATION

No. 117. Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 42, page A-21, as follows:

"Note 3: A member institution may not provide a student-athlete with financial aid in excess of 'commonly accepted educational expenses' as defined and controlled by C3-1-(f) and C3-4. A 'maximum initial award' refers to a scholarship, grant-in-aid or comparable financial aid commitment covering 'commonly accepted educational expenses' awarded by the institution to a particular student for the first time. A 'maximum additional award' refers to a scholarship, grant-in-aid or comparable financial aid

commitment covering 'commonly accepted educational expenses' awarded by the institution to a particular student who has previously received an initial award. Under this legislation, an institution may not award each year a greater number of such initial or additional awards, scholarships or grants-in-aid per sport than the numbers indicated in these two columns, respectively. A member institution, however, may administer such awards on the basis of an aggregate expenditure, except for the maximum additional awards in the sports of football and basketball. Under this procedure, in sports other than football and basketball, a member may multiply the value of 'commonly accepted educational expenses' at that institution by the number of initial awards or by the number of additional awards permitted for the particular sport and the resulting products are the respective maximum values of new financial aid awards and additional awards in effect in any one year which the member may provide to qualified student-athletes in that sport. The total number of recipients may exceed the number of initial awards indicated provided the respective aggregate dollar amounts are not exceeded. As to maximum additional awards in the sports of football and basketball, an institution may provide financial aid to other student-athletes in addition to the recipients of maximum initial awards provided that the maximum number of additional student-athletes receiving any form of financial aid together with any other countable players as defined in paragraph (a) does not exceed the number in the Maximum Additional Awards column."

"Note 4. In addition to the maximum initial awards in effect, an institution may provide financial aid to other student-athletes in the respective sports provided that the maximum number of additional student-athletes receiving any form of financial aid together with any other countable players as defined in paragraph (a) does not exceed the number in this column."

Source: Pacific-8 Conference.

Action: Approved by hand vote.

FINANCIAL AID

No. 118. Constitution: Amend Proposal No. 45, page A-24, as follows:

"(b) Where a student's athletic ability is taken into consideration in any degree in awarding him unearned financial aid, such aid combined with that received from the following and similar sources may not exceed the amount defined in Section 1-(f) of this Article and the Bylaws. In accordance with the membership divisions described in Article 6 of the Bylaws, such limitations adopted in the Bylaws may be applicable only to the membership division which adopts them."

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Approved by hand vote.

LIMITATIONS ON NUMBER OF COACHES

No. 119. Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 50, page A-31, as follows:

"Section 1. Football Coaching Staff. No member institution may

employ use more than eight persons on its athletic staff whose primary purpose is the organization and coaching of its intercollegiate football program and the eight individuals may recruit off campus. Three Part-time student-coaches may be employed used, but their compensation individually may not exceed the value of commonly accepted educational expenses at that institution. The Part-time student-coaches may not recruit off campus."

"Section 2. Basketball Coaching Staff. No member institution may employ more than three persons on its athletic staff whose primary purpose is the organization and coaching of its intercollegiate basketball program and the three individuals may recruit off campus. One Part-time student-coach coaches may be employed used, but his their compensation may not exceed the value of commonly accepted educational expenses at that institution. The Part-time student-coach coaches may not recruit off campus."

Source: Big Ten Conference.

Action: Not considered by the Convention.

ENTERTAINMENT

No. 120. Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 59, page A-36, as follows:

"(i) A member institution may entertain high school coaches only on its campus. Such entertainment may include providing a maximum of two complimentary tickets to home athletic contests."

Source: Big Eight Conference.

Action: Approved by hand vote.

COLLEGE DIVISION LACROSSE CHAMPIONSHIP

No. 121. Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 97, page A-55, as follows:

"Section 3. Only active members in good standing which have designated College Division in accordance with the provisions of Bylaw 4-6-(a) shall be eligible for the following meets and tournaments established under the auspices of the Association:

*The National College Division Baseball Championship
The National College Division Basketball Championship
The National College Division Cross Country Championships
The National College Division Golf Championships
The National College Division Gymnastics Championships
The National College Division Lacrosse Championship
(effective August 1, 1973)*

*The National College Division Swimming Championships
The National College Division Tennis Championships
The National College Division Outdoor Track Championships
The National College Division Wrestling Championships"*

Source: NCAA Executive Committee (NCAA College Committee).

Intent: To establish the Championship.

Action: Approved by hand vote.

Appendix D

Official Procedure Governing The NCAA Enforcement Program

As approved and adopted by the Council and Convention of the Association

Individuals employed by or associated with member institutions for the administration, the conduct or the coaching of intercollegiate athletics are, in the final analysis, teachers of young people. Their responsibility is an affirmative one and they must do more than avoid improper conduct or questionable acts. Their own moral values must be so certain and positive that those younger and more pliable will be influenced by a fine example. Much more is expected of them than of the less critically placed citizen.

All representatives of educational institutions are expected to cooperate fully with the NCAA investigative staff, Committee on Infractions and Council to further the objectives of the Association and its enforcement program. The enforcement procedures are an essential part of the intercollegiate athletic program of each member institution and require full and complete disclosure by all institutional representatives of any relevant information requested by the NCAA investigative staff, Committee on Infractions or Council during the course of an inquiry.

Section 1. The Council shall designate a Committee on Infractions which shall be responsible to administer the NCAA enforcement program. The Committee shall: (1) consider complaints which may be filed with the Association charging the failure of any member to maintain the academic or athletic standards required for membership or the failure of any member to meet the conditions and obligations of membership in the Association; (2) provide general guidance to the NCAA investigative staff in the development of information related to alleged violations; (3) determine facts related to alleged violations and find violations of NCAA rules and requirements; (4) impose appropriate penalties on a member found to be in violation, or recommend to the Council suspension or termination of membership; (5) carry out any other duties directly related to the administration of the Association's enforcement program. The Committee shall be composed of five members, one of whom shall serve as chairman. Three members present and voting shall constitute a quorum for conduct of Committee business, it being understood that the chairman shall make a special effort to have full Committee attendance when major infractions cases involving violations are to be considered.

Section 2. All allegations and complaints relative to a member's failure to maintain the academic or athletic standards required for membership, the member's violation of the legislation or regulations of the Association, or the member's failure otherwise to meet the conditions and obligations of membership, shall be received by the Committee or the Association's executive director and channeled to the NCAA investigative staff. The investigative staff, so far as practicable and under the general guidance of the Committee, shall make a thorough investigation of all such charges which are received from responsible sources and are reasonably substantial. The investigative staff may conduct a preliminary inquiry to determine whether there is adequate evidence to warrant an official inquiry, and in conducting this inquiry the services of a field investigator may be used. Under the general guidance of the Committee, the investigative staff also may initiate an investigation on its own motion when it has reasonable cause to believe that a member is or has been in violation of its obligations as a member of the Association.

Section 3. If the Committee on Infractions, after consideration of the information which has been developed and after consultation with the investigative staff, determines that there has been a violation not of a serious nature, it may privately reprimand and censure without a hearing; if it determines that an allegation or complaint warrants an official inquiry, it shall determine its scope and thrust and direct a letter to the chief executive officer of the member involved (with copies to the faculty representative and athletic director of the member, to the executive officer of the allied conference of which the institution is a member and to the Association vice-president of the district in which the member is located) fully informing him of the matter under inquiry and requesting his cooperation to the end that the facts may be discovered. By this letter, the Committee shall call upon the chief executive officer of the member involved for the disclosure of all relevant information and may require his appearance or the appearance of his representative before the Committee at a time and place which is mutually convenient, if such appearance is deemed necessary by the Committee. Similarly, a member which is subject to official inquiry shall, upon its request, be given the opportunity to have representatives appear before the Committee. If a member declines to meet with the Committee after having been requested to do so, the member shall not have the right to appeal either the Committee's findings of facts and violations or the resultant penalty.

Section 4. (a) If a member appears before the Committee to discuss its response to the Committee's official inquiry, the hearing shall be directed toward the general scope of the official inquiry but shall not preclude the Committee from finding any violation resulting from information developed or discussed during the hearing. During the hearing, the investigative staff first shall present the information which its investigation has developed. The member will then present its explanation of the alleged violations and questionable practices, and any other arguments or information which it deems appropriate in the Committee's consideration of the case. The Committee, at the discretion of any of its members, shall question representatives of the member or the investigative staff, as well as any other persons ap-

pearing before it, in order to determine the facts of the case. Further, under the direction of the Committee, questions and information may be exchanged between and among all parties participating in the hearing. The exact procedure to be followed in the conduct of the hearing will be determined by the Committee.

(b) After all presentations have been made and the hearing has been concluded, the Committee shall excuse all others from the hearing and the Committee shall make its determinations of fact and violation. In arriving at its determinations, it may request additional information from any appropriate source including the member or the investigative staff. If the Committee determines there has been a violation or questionable practice, it shall impose an appropriate penalty, or it may recommend to the Council suspension or termination of membership in an appropriate case. The finding of a violation or questionable practice shall be by majority vote of the members of the Committee present and voting. The imposition of a penalty or recommended action shall require the favorable vote of at least three members of the Committee.

Section 5. The Committee, without prior public announcement, shall be obligated to promptly submit a written report, which sets forth its findings and penalty to be imposed, to the chief executive officer of the member (with copies to those individuals receiving copies of the official inquiry) which has been subject to the official inquiry. The member then shall have the right to give written notice of appeal of the Committee's findings, the penalty, or both, to the Council. To be considered by the Council, the notice of appeal must be received by the NCAA executive director, Kansas City, Missouri, not later than 15 calendar days from the date the member institution received the Committee's report. The member's notice of appeal shall contain a statement of the date the Committee's report was received by the chief executive officer. If the notice of appeal is not received within the 15-day period, or the member determines not to appeal, the action of the Committee will be promptly announced by the Committee through the NCAA executive office or at any other site determined by the Committee. The Committee shall forward a report of the case to the Council at the time of public announcement. If appropriate notice of appeal is received, no public announcement will be made until conclusion of the case by the Council. Determinations of fact and violations arrived at in the foregoing manner by the Committee, or by the Council on appeal, shall be final, binding and conclusive, and shall not be subject to further review by the Council or any other authority.

Section 6. The Committee shall be obligated to submit a written summary statement to the Council on each case that is subject to appeal, and it shall include:

- (1) A statement of the origin of the case.
- (2) Violations of NCAA requirements or questionable practices in light of NCAA requirements, as determined by Committee.
- (3) Related factors appropriate for consideration in judgment of case.

- (4) Disciplinary or corrective actions taken by institution or conference, or any other agency involved in particular incident.

During an appeal to the Council, the chairman or another member of the Committee shall present the Committee's report. The member institution, if it desires to be represented before the Council, may challenge the Committee's finding of fact or penalty, or both. The Council then shall act upon the member's appeal and may accept the Committee's findings and penalty, alter either one or both or make its own findings and impose a penalty which it believes appropriate.

Section 7. (a) The Constitution of the Association provides that disciplinary or corrective actions other than termination or suspension of membership may be effected during the period between annual Conventions by the Committee on Infractions. As a guiding principle, the NCAA penalty should be broad and severe if the violation or violations reflect a general disregard for the governing rules; in those instances in which the violation or violations are isolated and of relative insignificance, then the NCAA penalty shall be specific and limited. Previous violations of NCAA legislation shall be a contributing factor in determining the degree of penalty.

Among the disciplinary measures, singly or in combination, which may be adopted by the Committee or Council and imposed against an institution are:

- (1) Reprimand and censure;
- (2) Probation for one year;
- (3) Probation for more than one year;
- (4) Ineligibility for one or more National Collegiate Championship events;
- (5) Ineligibility for invitational and postseason meets and tournaments;
- (6) Ineligibility for any television programs subject to the Association's control or administration;
- (7) Ineligibility of the member to vote or its personnel to serve on committees of the Association, or both;
- (8) Requirement that a member institution which has been found in violation show cause why:
 - (i) a penalty or an additional penalty should not be imposed if, in the opinion of the Committee (or Council), it does not take appropriate disciplinary or corrective action against athletic department personnel involved in the infractions case, any other institutional employee if the circumstances warrant, the student-athlete involved or representatives of the institution's athletic interests; or
 - (ii) a recommendation should not be made to the membership that the institution's membership in the Association be suspended or terminated if, in the opinion of the Committee (or Council), it does not take appropriate disciplinary or corrective action against the head coach of the sport involved, any other institutional employee if the circumstances warrant, the student-athlete involved or representatives of the institution's athletic interests.

"Appropriate disciplinary or corrective action" may include, for example, termination of the coaching contract of the head coach and any assistants involved; suspension or termination of the employment status of any other institutional employee who may be involved; declaration of ineligibility for any student-athlete involved for a specific period; severance of relations with any representative of the institution's athletic interests who may be involved; the debarment of the head or assistant coach from any coaching, recruiting or speaking engagements for a specified period, and the prohibition of all recruiting in a specified sport for a specified period. The nature and extent of such action shall be the determination of the institution after due notice and hearing to the individuals concerned, but the determination of whether or not the action is appropriate in the fulfillment of NCAA policies and principles, and its resulting effect on any institutional penalty, shall be solely that of the Committee (or Council). Where this requirement is made, the institution shall show cause, or in the alternative, shall show the appropriate disciplinary or corrective action taken, in writing, to the Committee (or Council) within fifteen (15) days thereafter. The Committee (or Council) may, without further hearing, determine on the basis of such writing whether or not in its opinion appropriate disciplinary or corrective action has been taken, and may impose a penalty or additional penalty, take no further action, or it may, by notice to the institution, conduct a further hearing at a later date before making a final determination.

(b) In some instances, an institution is rendered ineligible to appear on television programs administered or controlled by the Association. When an institution is banned from such television programs, the penalty shall specify that the institution may not enter into any contracts or agreements for such appearances until the institution's probationary status has been terminated and it has been restored to full rights and privileges of membership.

(c) When an institution has been found to be in violation of NCAA requirements, and the report reflects academic violations or questionable academic procedures, the NCAA executive director shall be authorized to forward a copy of the report to the appropriate regional accrediting agency.

(d) If the Committee, after a review of institutional or conference action taken in connection with a rule infraction, concludes that the corrective or punitive action taken by the institution or conference is representative of and consistent with NCAA policies and principles, the Committee may exercise the discretion to take no further action. Also, the Committee may adopt a penalty comparable to the institutional or conference penalty without conducting a hearing with the member; however, the Committee shall notify the member of the NCAA rules or regulations violated and the proposed penalty, and advise the member of the opportunity for a hearing. The member must request such a hearing within fifteen days of the receipt of the Com-

mittee's notification, if such a hearing is to be held. If a member requests such a hearing, the procedures outlined in Section 4 shall be followed. In the absence of a member's request for a hearing, the Committee shall impose the penalty and if appropriate make public announcement of its action. Punitive or corrective action taken by an institution or conference shall not prevent the Committee from taking any punitive action which it deems advisable or warranted in any case. In cases of serious violation, the NCAA should not leave the discipline in such cases exclusively to an institution or conference.

Section 8. When a penalty has been imposed and publicly announced, there shall be no review of the penalty except upon a showing of newly discovered evidence which is directly related to the findings in the case, or that there was a prejudicial error in the procedure which was followed in the processing of the case by the Committee. Any institution which initiates such a review shall be required to submit a brief of its appeal to the Committee at least 30 days prior to a Committee meeting and furnish sufficient copies of the brief for distribution to all members of the Committee; thereupon, the Committee shall review the brief and decide by majority vote whether it shall grant a hearing of the appeal. Disciplinary measures imposed by the institution or its conference, subsequent to the NCAA's action, may be considered to be "newly discovered evidence" for the purposes of this paragraph. If a hearing of the appeal is granted, the Committee may reduce or eliminate any penalty, but may not impose any new penalty. The Committee's decision with respect to the penalty shall be final and conclusive for all purposes.

Section 9. When the Committee or NCAA Council finds that there has been a violation of the Constitution or Bylaws affecting the eligibility of an individual student-athlete or student-athletes, the institution involved and its conference (if the institution holds such affiliation with an allied member) shall be notified of the violation and the name(s) of the student-athlete(s) involved, it being understood that if the institution fails to take appropriate action, the involved institution shall be cited to show cause under the Association's regular enforcement procedures why it should not be disciplined for failure to do so. It is understood that if an institution concludes that continued application of the rule(s) would work an injustice on any student-athlete, an appeal shall be submitted to the Council and promptly acted upon by the body or a sub-committee designated by it.

Section 10. The Committee on Infractions and the Council shall treat all cases before them as confidential, except as provided above, until the same have been announced in accordance with the prescribed procedures. Any member of the Committee on Infractions or Council who is directly connected with an institution under inquiry shall not take part in any NCAA proceedings connected with the case before the Committee or the Council.

Appendix E

67th ANNUAL CONVENTION

Nominating Committee

Chairman—Louis A. Myers

District 1—Robert W. Pritchard, Worcester Polytechnic Institute
District 2—Peter A. Carlesimo, Fordham University
District 3—Ralph E. Fadum, North Carolina State University
District 4—Chalmers W. Elliott, University of Iowa
District 5—Wade R. Stinson, University of Kansas
District 6—J. Neils Thompson, University of Texas, Austin
District 7—Louis A. Myers, University of Arizona
District 8—Hubert H. Heitman, University of California, Davis
At-Large—H. Boyd McWhorter, Southeastern Conference
At-Large—Robert M. Strimer, Ohio Wesleyan University
At-Large—George H. Hobson, Alabama A&M University

Committee on Committees

Chairman—Karl Kurth Jr.

District 1—Herbert W. Gallagher, Northeastern University
District 2—Robert H. Frailey, American University
District 3—William M. Bell, Fayetteville State University
District 4—J. William Orwig, Indiana University
District 5—Floyd Gass, Oklahoma State University
District 6—James B. Higgins Jr., Lamar University
District 7—Fred L. Miller, Arizona State University
District 8—Kenneth Karr, San Diego State University
At-Large—Thomas A. Cartmill, St. Lawrence University
At-Large—John A. Pfitsch, Grinnell College
At-Large—Karl Kurth Jr., Trinity College

Committee on Voting

Chairman—Thomas J. Frericks

District 1—Harold S. Westerman, University of Maine, Orono
District 2—Edward M. Czekaj, Pennsylvania State University
District 3—John R. Bell, East Tennessee State University
District 4—Edward Weaver, Ohio State University
District 5—Stanley J. Marshall, South Dakota State University
District 6—Ulysses S. Jones Sr., Southern University
District 7—Stan Bates, Western Athletic Conference
District 8—George F. Ilg, Fresno State University
At-Large—Thomas J. Frericks, University of Dayton

Committee on Memorial Resolutions

Chairman—Edwin P. Horner

C. D. Henry, Grambling College
Edwin P. Horner, Baylor University
Max O. Schultze, University of Minnesota, St. Paul

Committee on Credentials

Chairman—Carl E. Abner

Carl E. Abner, University of Louisville
Rolla L. Anderson, Kalamazoo College
Kenneth N. Vickery, Clemson University

Parliamentarian

Marcus L. Plant, University of Michigan

Chairman of Business Sessions

Earl M. Ramer, University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Chairman of Round Table

Samuel E. Barnes, District of Columbia Teachers College

Appendix F Past and Present Officers of the NCAA

President

1906-1913	Capt. Palmer E. Pierce, U. S. Military Academy
1914-1916	LeBaron R. Briggs, Harvard University
1917-1929	Brig. Gen. Palmer E. Pierce, U. S. Military Academy
1930-1932	Charles W. Kennedy, Princeton University
1933-1937	Maj. John L. Griffith, Intercollegiate Conference
1938-1940	William B. Owens, Stanford University
1941-1944	Philip O. Badger, New York University
1945-1946	Wilbur C. Smith, Tulane University, University of Wyoming
1947-1949	Karl E. Leib, University of Iowa
1950-1952	Hugh C. Willett, University of Southern California
1953-1954	Albert B. Moore, University of Alabama
1955-1956	Clarence P. Houston, Tufts College
1957-1958	Frank N. Gardner, Drake University
1959-1960	Herbert J. Dorricott, Western Colorado State College
1961-1962	Henry B. Hardt, Texas Christian University
1963-1964	Robert F. Ray, University of Iowa
1965-1966	Everett D. Barnes, Colgate University
1967-1968	Marcus L. Plant, University of Michigan
1969-1970	Harry M. Cross, University of Washington
1971-1972	Karl M. Ramer, University of Tennessee
1973-	Alan T. Chapman, Rice University

Secretary-Treasurer

1906-1908	Louis A. Bevier, Jr., Rutgers University
*1908	William A. Lambeth, University of Virginia
1909-1939	Frank W. Nicolson, Wesleyan University
1940-1944	Maj. John L. Griffith, Intercollegiate Conference
1945-1951	Kenneth L. Wilson, Intercollegiate Conference
1952-1954	Karl S. Fullbrook, University of Nebraska
1955-1956	Ralph W. Aigler, University of Michigan
1957-1958	Edwin D. Mouszon, Jr., Southern Methodist University
1959-1960	Gen. Percy L. Sadler, Lehigh University
1961-1962	Rev. Wilfred H. Crowley, Santa Clara University
1963-1964	Everett D. Barnes, Colgate University
1965-1966	Francis E. Smiley, Colorado School of Mines
1967-1968	Ernest B. McCoy, Pennsylvania State University
1969-1970	William J. Flynn, Boston College
1971-1972	Samuel E. Barnes, Howard University, District of Columbia Teachers College
1973-	Richard P. Koenig, Valparaiso University

*Bevier served as secretary. Lambeth as treasurer, in 1908.

Appendix G NCAA Convention Sites, 1944-1973

(Hotels in parentheses.)

1944	New York City (Biltmore)	*38th
1945	Columbus, Ohio (Deshler-Wallick)	39th
1946	St. Louis (Jefferson)	40th
1947	New York City (New Yorker)	41st
1948	New York City (New Yorker)	42nd
1949	San Francisco (Saint Francis)	43rd
1950	New York City (Commodore)	44th
1951	Dallas (Adolphus)	45th
1952	Cincinnati (Netherland Plaza)	46th
1953	Washington (Mayflower)	47th
1954	Cincinnati (Netherland Plaza)	48th
1955	New York City (New Yorker)	49th
1956	Los Angeles (Statler Hilton)	50th
1957	St. Louis (Jefferson)	51st
1958	Philadelphia (Bellvue Stratford)	52nd
1959	Cincinnati (Netherland Hilton)	53rd
1960	New York City (Astor)	54th
1961	Pittsburgh (Penn Sheraton)	55th
1962	Chicago (Conrad Hilton)	56th
1963	Los Angeles (Statler Hilton)	57th
1964	New York City (Commodore)	58th
1965	Chicago (Conrad Hilton)	59th
1966	Washington (Sheraton Park)	60th
1967	Houston (Sheraton Lincoln)	61st
1968	New York City (Biltmore)	62nd
1969	Los Angeles (Hilton)	63rd
1970	Washington (Statler Hilton)	64th
1971	Houston (Astraworld)	65th
1972	Hollywood, Florida (Diplomat)	66th
1973	Chicago (Palmer House)	67th

*NOTE: Prior to 1944, the annual Convention was held in December. No meeting was held in 1943 and commencing with 1944 the Convention has been held in January.

1974 Convention

Saint Francis Hotel, San Francisco, California, January 7-9

1975 Convention

Sheraton-Park Hotel, Washington, D.C., January 6-8



NCAA

1NCAA000112520

